

Christian Education

Vol. XIII

DECEMBER, 1929

No. 3

THE NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ROBERT L. KELLY

PLACE

The Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education is to be held at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

TIME

The meeting opens at 10:00 o'clock Monday morning, January 13, 1930, and continues through Tuesday afternoon, January 14.

HOTEL RATES

At the Willard, the following special rate is quoted to those who attend the meetings of the Council and affiliated organizations: single room with bath, \$4.00; room with double bed and bath, \$6.00; room with twin beds and bath, \$7.00. Many other good hotels are located within a short distance of the headquarters—the Raleigh, the Harrington, the Washington, the Grace Dodge, the Mayflower, etc. The Council office or the Washington Convention Bureau will be glad to send you a list of hotels on request.

REDUCED FARE

Certificates obtained from ticket sellers showing the purchase of railroad tickets not earlier than January 9, nor later than January 15, will be validated at the meeting for the purchase of return tickets at one-half rate, good up to and including January 22, provided not less than 150 such certificates are presented.

THE PROGRAM

The general theme of the meeting is—*How can Christian education meet the two-fold demand of leading students to think and of teaching them what to think?*

At the *Monday morning* session, the Council members will worship and think together in reviewing the work of the year and in making concerted plans for the year that is to come. The leaders in this review and preview will be the officers of the Council, the members of the permanent staff who find it possible to attend, and the chairmen of the several Standing Committees.

On *Monday afternoon*, Dr. William Chalmers Covert, General Secretary of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., will lead the discussion of the place and functions of the Council and of the Church Boards of Education, outlining definite plans of procedure.

The discussion will be participated in by the members of the Council and our special guests.

A summary will be made by Dr. F. W. Padelford, Executive Secretary of the Board of Education of the Northern Baptist Convention.

Monday evening. This session will be given over to a consideration of the possible creation of a student movement that will meet the demands made upon it by the problems of modern higher education.

Tuesday morning. The special question for consideration will be, *How may the institutions and agencies of higher education affiliated with the churches be so organized and conducted as to resolve the apparent dilemma lurking in the two-fold statement of the general theme of the meeting?*

Dr. N. J. G. Wickey, Executive Secretary of the Board of Education of the United Lutheran Church, will lead the discussion in which all members of the Council and others present are invited to participate. Dr. William S. Bovard, Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, will summarize and close the discussion.

Tuesday afternoon. This session will be another of the series of mass meetings at which "*The Place of Religion in American Higher Education*" will again be reviewed.

It is believed that there is much material in this issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION and in the October and November issues, just preceding, which will serve as source material for those who shall participate in the discussions at Washington.

THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges will be held at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 14-16, 1930.

BANQUET RESERVATIONS

The reservations for the Association banquet on Tuesday evening, January 14, should be made directly to the Willard Hotel. Please note that this dinner is Tuesday and not Thursday evening as heretofore.

To be sure of satisfactory service the reservations both for the room and for the banquet should be made now. Such reservations can be cancelled later if it becomes necessary.

THE PROGRAM

Note: The banquet on Tuesday evening, January 14, will be at the Willard Hotel and will be formal and informal. Price, per plate, \$3.50. Address the Hotel Willard direct for reservations.

A banquet speaker of international prominence will be provided on a subject in harmony with the forthcoming London Conference on International Peace and Goodwill.

The morning session on Wednesday, January 15, will be devoted to a résumé of the work of the year, with special attention to the development of the Intellectual Life Project and the developments in the field of the Preparation of College Teachers.

The afternoon session on Wednesday, January 15, will have as its general theme "The Education of College Teachers,"—from the standpoint of the graduate schools and from the standpoint of the undergraduate colleges.

The evening session of Wednesday, January 15, will be devoted to a discussion of the significance and meaning of the Intellectual Life Project. The problem will be viewed from the American, the English, the French and the German points of view.

The closing session on Thursday morning, January 16, will be occupied with the recommendations of the standing commissions, the admission of new members, the election of officers and the setting up of machinery for the Intellectual Life Project.

There will be a closing address by a speaker of international prominence.

SPECIAL PUBLICITY AND EXHIBITS

There has been a bumper crop of books within the last season or two dealing with the problems of Christian education and of college administration and teaching. For the annual meeting at Washington, special efforts are being made in the joint office of the Association-Council to exhibit some of this material.

There will be:

- (a) A list of books and Ph.D. dissertations dealing with Christian education particularly in higher institutions of learning.
- (b) An exhibit of books to be known as a "College President's Professional Library" made up of those books of a professional nature which college presidents have found valuable to them.
- (c) An exhibit of college publicity. This exhibit will include literature and other material put out by the colleges as regular publicity and in connection with publicity campaigns.

MEETINGS OF THE CHURCH EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

The meetings of the Church Educational Associations this year follow the meeting of the Association of American Colleges. At the time CHRISTIAN EDUCATION goes to press detailed programs are not completed. The following official announcements are authorized and it is known that several other church college groups plan for meetings in Washington. Information concerning such may be obtained by addressing the Association or Board Secretaries concerned, whose names will be found in the November issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, pp. 119-121.

Annual Meeting of the Association of Colleges of Congregational Affiliation in conjunction with Presidents of Colleges of the Christian Denomination. The Annual Meeting of the Association of Colleges of Congregational Affiliation, in which the Presidents of the Colleges of the Christian Church unite, will take the form of the usual luncheon, at the Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C., at 12:30 Thursday, January 16.

There will be a Round Table on "Present-Day Problems of the Christian College." President W. A. Harper, of Elon College, will address the meeting on "Religious Education at Elon College." President D. J. Cowling, of Carleton College, will speak on "Annual Financial Reports." Dean L. A. Weigle, of Yale Divinity School, will be the third speaker, topic—"Teaching with Authority." Dr. W. R. Kedzie, the new Secretary of the Foundation for Education, will present the plans of the Foundation.

The officers of the Association are: *President:* President C. C. Mierow, Colorado College; *Vice-President:* President A. G. Caris, Defiance College; *Secretary and Treasurer:* President A. E. Vestling, Olivet College.

Annual Meeting of the Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Annual Meeting of the Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church will be held at the Willard Hotel, January 16 and 17, beginning at 2:15 o'clock Thursday afternoon, when Professor Floyd W. Reeves, of the University of Chicago, Director of the Educational Survey now in progress, will report concerning his work.

At 6:30 P. M. the American University will be host at a complimentary banquet, following which Bishop W. F. McDowell will speak.

On Friday morning the topic "How to Rate College Teachers" will be presented by President J. L. McConaughy, of Wesleyan University, and general discussion will be opened by President F. M. Hunter, of the University of Denver; President Henry M. Wriston, of Lawrence College, will then present the subject of "Student Participation in the Government of Educational Institutions," and general discussion will be led by President Alexander Guerry, of the University of Chattanooga.

On Friday afternoon Principal A. T. Schulmaier, of East Greenwich Academy, will speak at 2:00 P. M. on "What Co-operative Relationships Can Be Established between the Secondary Schools and the Colleges." At 3:00 o'clock there will be separate meetings of the theological and secondary school sections; Dean A. C. Knudson, of Boston University School of Theology, and President F. C. Eiselen, of Garrett Biblical Institute, will speak to the theological group; Headmasters H. P. Davis, of Bucksport Seminary, and F. H. Green, of Pennington School for Boys, to the secondary school principals.

The officers of the Association are: *President*: President A. A. Brown, Drew University; *First Vice-President*: President E. P. Robertson, Wesley College (N. D.); *Second Vice-President*: President C. E. Hamilton, Cazenovia Seminary; *Secretary*: President John L. Seaton, Albion College; *Treasurer*: Headmaster T. W. Watkins, Tilton School.

Annual Meeting of the Presbyterian College Union. The Presbyterian College Union will hold its annual meeting at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday and Friday, January 16 and 17, 1930.

The tentative program is not yet completed but it is expected that the following topics will be discussed: "College Cooperation in the Zone Campaigns of the Board of Christian Education;" "Expanding College Budgets and How to Meet Them;" "College Curricula and the Liberal Arts."

The officers of the Association are: *President*: President W. A. Ganfield, Carroll College; *Secretary*: President Harry M. Gage, Coe College.

The National Association of Biblical Instructors will meet at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, December 31 and January 1. Professor William H. Wood, Dartmouth College, is Chairman of the Program Committee.

**CALENDAR OF EDUCATIONAL MEETINGS,
JANUARY 13-17, 1930, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

9:30 A. M. **Monday, January 13**

Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education. Morning, afternoon and evening sessions. The Willard. See program, pp. 125-126. Adjournment, Tuesday afternoon.

9:00 A. M. **Tuesday, January 14**

Annual Meeting, Council of Church Boards of Education, continued. The Willard.

2:30 P. M.

Union Mass Meeting. Theme—"The Place of Religion in American Higher Education." The Willard.

7:00 P. M.

Sixteenth Annual Meeting, Association of American Colleges. Dinner session. The Willard. See program, pp. 127-128.

10:00 A. M. **Wednesday, January 15**

Annual Meeting, Association of American Colleges, continued. Morning, afternoon and evening sessions. The Willard.

9:30 A. M. **Thursday, January 16**

Annual Meeting, Association of American Colleges, continued. The Willard. Adjournment at noon.

1:00 P. M.

Annual Luncheon, Association of Colleges of Congregational Affiliation. College Presidents of the Christian Church uniting. Theme—"Present Day Problems of the Christian College." Speakers: President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College; Dean Luther A. Weigle, Divinity School, Yale University; President W. A. Harper, Elon College; Dr. W. R. Kedzie, the Congregational Foundation for Education. The Cosmos Club. See program, p. 129.

2:15 P. M.

Board of Education, Five Years' Meeting of Friends in America. Afternoon, evening and Friday morning sessions. Hotel Willard.

Annual Meeting, Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Afternoon, evening sessions. The Willard. Adjourns Friday afternoon. See program, p. 129. Banquet 6:30 P. M. at American University.

3:00 P. M.

General Educational Board of the Church of the Brethren. Afternoon and evening sessions. Home of Secretary J. S. Noffsinger, 3635 Ordway Street, N. W.

7:00

Annual Meeting of the Presbyterian College Union. The Willard. See program announcement, p. 130.

9:00 A. M.

Friday, January 17

Annual Meeting, Presbyterian College Union, continued. The Willard.

Annual Meeting, Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church, continued. The Willard.

2:00 P. M.

Annual Meeting, Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church, continued. Sectional meetings for Theological Schools and Secondary Schools at 3:00 P. M.. The Willard.

Other Meetings

The Southern Baptist Education Association will meet in Birmingham, Ala., on February 4.

The Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will meet in Memphis, Tenn., February 4 and 5, 1930.

The Association of Schools, Colleges and Seminaries of the Reformed Church in the United States will meet in Atlantic City, N. J., in connection with the Western Section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, about March 1.

The National Lutheran Educational Conference will meet in Chicago, Ill., in connection with the meeting of the North Central Association, the middle of March.

HOW THE CHURCH COLLEGES LOOK TO THE BOARDS OF EDUCATION*

DR. WILLARD DAYTON BROWN, Secretary
The Board of Education, Reformed Church in America

The topic states the question in bold outlines. There is no church board of education, probably, that does not feel that in its relations with the colleges of the denomination it has a major problem with which to deal. It does not delude or burden itself with the belief that it alone is responsible for the solution of that problem. The greater part of the responsibility lies with the colleges themselves. But the boards also cannot escape a large share of the responsibility. However, the statement of the topic makes it necessary that a broad view of the question shall be taken. These colleges are not merely a problem. They constitute a challenge. It is not enough to consider the liabilities of the case. Notice must be taken of the assets as well. It is not enough to think upon the difficulties that confront our colleges, from the point of view of religion and church connection. Attention must be paid to the contributions which the colleges can make to those solutions.

NUMBER OF COLLEGES

One of the first of the problems presented to the church boards by the church colleges may be expressed in terms of numbers. There is no doubt that, at the present time, they are altogether too numerous to be efficient. That may not be so twenty-five years from now, but it is no doubt true now. It will probably not be so, provided there are no increases in the numbers of them during that time. Growth of population during that period may make all of the present number necessary. But at present there is little doubt that they are too many.

1. Considered from the viewpoint of their enrolment, their inadequate endowments, their poorly paid faculties, their restricted curricula and their meager facilities, it looks as though there might well be some mergers, after the manner and habits of the

* Address before the Pan Presbyterian Conference, Philadelphia, October 4, 1929.

business world, which would appreciably reduce fixed charges, foster greater efficiency, and result in much more satisfactory academic profits that would benefit the whole constituency. I quote in substantiation of that position, posited by the experiences of the last ten years, some figures compiled a few years ago by our own beloved Dr. Robert L. Kelly, of the Council of Church Boards of Education, in which he makes the following statement:

One characteristic of the American colleges is their remarkable vitality. Eleven of them are older than the American Government. . . . As our country developed, institutions claiming college or higher rank multiplied in number until now there are almost thirteen hundred whose catalogues have been collected. They include colleges, junior colleges, universities, professional and technical schools. In one State alone—Ohio—there are forty-three; Pennsylvania has forty-two and Illinois forty. While all of these institutions claim college status, less than a thousand are entitled to the name college and only some five or six hundred are recognized as of standard grade in their respective fields. Less than two hundred are recognized by the Association of American Universities as preparing adequately for graduate work.—*Tendencies in College Administration*, pp. 1-3.

2. Considered also from the point of view of the funds handled by the treasuries of the various church boards of education and available for distribution to them to supplement their meager incomes, these denominational offspring are more numerous than is consistent with the actual ability of the denomination in the matter of providing the necessary food, clothing and shelter. It might have been better if there had been some scientific, academic birth control exercised in the years gone by.

3. Considered again from the standpoint of location, related constituency and possible support, one is almost forced to the same conclusion. So closely are they situated in some instances, that there is not only competition with others of their own faith, but even more so with those of other denominations. In 1925, Dr. J. S. Noffsinger compiled some figures relative to the average number of denominational constituents per senior college. He found that they range from 10,750 among the Friends to 108,587 among the Southern Baptists. In my own denomination we count 71,771 constituents per senior college. Whether or not

that number of constituents is sufficient or more than sufficient to support a senior college may be a debatable question and a good many factors will have to be taken into consideration. But there is no question among us. We have decided unofficially that it is none too many. There went up a decided protest a year or two ago when some of our constituency with possibly more zeal for education under Christian auspices than actual knowledge of educational conditions and requirements, proposed to add to our academic burdens by organizing another junior college. Outside of a very narrow circle, the impression was general that we have all the collegiate institutions that we can profitably care for at the present time. But there are ten other denominations that are below us in that list, with smaller numbers of constituents per senior college than ours. All of these with one exception are below us also in per capita giving. Some day we should like to visit them and have them show us how they support their colleges on such small average numbers of constituents.

4. Considered, once more, and this time from the point of view of the colleges' responsibilities toward the students who are now the undergraduates and others who will be in the future, many of whom will also be alumni and alumnae, we find that they are to be the recipients of academic degrees that will be of restricted value either in securing positions or entering upon graduate work in universities of repute. With these facts in mind, is it not justifiable to ask for their *raison d'être*?

ATTITUDES OF THE COLLEGES

A second problem with which the church boards of education are faced arises from the apparent attitudes of the institutions themselves. It may be that here judgment is entirely misplaced, but sometimes they appear altogether too complacently content with the *status quo*.

1. But one treads cautiously on this particular ground. It is so easy to judge from appearances—and err. From the point of view of the office swivel chair, it is easy to criticize, and not so difficult to fall into a hypercritical and unsympathetic attitude. This must be avoided at all costs. At the same time, in some instances at least, there does not seem to be—to all appearances—

any great effort to reach the higher goals academically, until forced to do so by the pressure of circumstances or the activities of some outside agency.

2. But this is probably only in appearance. While it may seem that administrators and faculties are willing to go on indefinitely with lectures and recitations and the conferring of degrees, without more reference to academic standards for the institution and the consequences of their delinquency to student careers than is necessary, until these are called more or less forcibly to their attention, it is barely possible that this is the only course which appears open to them. In all fairness also we must assume that college officials and faculties are just as alert on these subjects as we, are just as keenly aware of the shortcomings of their institutions and just as anxious to remedy defects. In most instances they are hindered from doing this by a lack of material resources so pressing that most of their energy is consumed in dollar-chasing in order to insure payment of running expenses. And this does not reflect any great amount of credit on the churches that are sponsoring these institutions.

INFLUENCE OF A COLLEGE CONSTITUENCY

A third problem is one that is related to the influence of the so-called "constituency" of the college or colleges.

1. This is a body quite indefinite and undeterminate, hard to define accurately. But it plays an important part in the life of every college, particularly the church college.

Sometimes this constituency is identified quite closely with the alumni list and possibly some large and influential donors. Sometimes it includes the parents of the students and members of the communities from which they come. Usually its understanding of the problems of private school administration is very limited.

It is frequently consumed—indeed, usually, in the case of the church college—with a zeal for "Christian" education, *i.e.*, education under Christian auspices. Usually it has a conviction, generally tacit if not expressed, that an institution once launched can be trusted, and ought to be left to maintain itself. Certain definite results may be expected from such attitudes.

2. One result that this zeal for education under Christian auspices usually entails is that it has given us in this country an unusually large number of small institutions founded by the church originally and still clinging to the skirts of the church, which can only by the exercise of considerable charity be called educational institutions. While founded by the church, they are fostered by the church in no way commensurate with their needs or the importance of the work which they are attempting to do. They are all too often struggling in an apparently losing battle to maintain themselves in an academic world which is constantly enlarging and stiffening its academic requirements at a pace much faster than they—even with their slowly increasing and enlarging facilities and resources—are able to sustain.

3. Another result is that, as these facts are being better known, an unwholesome student reaction is setting in, especially graduate reaction. Alumni are coming back to their Alma Mater and asking of what value is their diploma, since they have had the experience of being denied a position because their college was not found on the accredited list of a standardizing agency (something of which they had likely never heard); or they had been refused admission to a graduate school, their credits not being acceptable there for the same reason.

4. Another implication lies in the field of the attitude of the State Education Departments, which are beginning also to scrutinize more closely the preparation of the professors and teachers, particularly when these colleges are offering teacher-training courses that presumably qualify their graduates to teach in the public schools of the State. (*Cf.* the situation in X— where practically the whole faculty was found enrolled in summer schools this year pursuing studies requisite for the securing of a graduate degree.)

5. But the constituency of these schools will not think for a moment of abandoning these institutions or lowering their status (*e.g.*, from that of a senior to that of a junior college, in which latter field many of them might function much more efficiently). There are, without doubt, worthy motives back of this attitude.

But there is another side to the picture. The church college is not merely a problem for church boards of education. The

church college is a challenge to church boards of education. It is not merely a liability. It is a decided asset. It is not merely a question mark. It is an opportunity.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE CHURCH COLLEGE

The church college challenges the church boards by the very fact of its needs and its all-too-evident deficiencies.

1. If the church college has not the standing, equipment and facilities to enable it to hold up its head with the best in the land—as it so frequently has not—to whom shall it go for them except to the mother that gave it birth and nourished it at the maternal breast? It was founded by the church. What could be more natural than that the church should give it her full and hearty support at least in sufficient amount to guarantee efficient work?

But, along comes one who may or may not have a decided interest in some other phase of the church's vast enterprises and says that the outgoing functions of the church do not lie in that field but in others that have to do more closely with the evangelization of the world and the preaching of the Gospel to all nations. Sometimes he rehearses the old definition of a university as a football stadium with a faculty and a few classrooms attached; or he speaks of what he calls the superficial character of all collegiate education of our day; or the tendency to wean students away from their early religious allegiances; or any other of the current appraisals of the higher academic world that pass muster in critical circles. And he asks what fellowship the church can have with these who have deserted or so changed the ways of religion as to make them practically unrecognizable by many devout people.

He admits that it is true that the colleges were founded by the church, but they were also founded by the church for a particular purpose. That purpose was to educate men for the ministry largely. Times have changed. They are no longer educating men for the ministry, but for a hundred other professions, many of which have only a remote connection with or interest in the church. In many instances, not one per cent of their output finds its way into the ministry.

The difficulties before the church board of education are thus multiplied in the field of its appeal to the churches for funds for the church colleges. And the heart of the difficulty seems to be that the church has not yet thought out an adequate estimate of the relationship between it and its schools nor formulated a philosophy of it that is not easily vulnerable to the attacks of even its mildest critics. What is the basis of such an appeal to the churches?

The time has passed apparently, or at least is in eclipse, when we can make that appeal from the point of view of denominational loyalty. Denominational lines are not being drawn very closely in these days and the whole area of denominational being is under scrutiny of a critical nature. Denominationalism is being weighed in the balances and it looks as though it will be found wanting in most respects. It has lost its attractiveness, its drawing power, its "punch"—to use a colloquialism of the times. It will not suffice.

The appeal to the churches for financial and other support for the church colleges cannot be made, also, with great hope of success, on the basis of the contribution which the colleges are making directly to the life of the church. Even with colleges like our own, one of which holds the record today for having sent the highest percentage of its living graduates into the direct work of the church, it is being seriously questioned in many quarters whether they are making such an objective contribution to the life of the church as to warrant the large degree of support which they are actually receiving from the funds of the board of education. There are so many departments in the colleges that have little relation to the church in the mind of the average church member; there are so many activities of the colleges and the student bodies that seem to ignore the church and church relations; there is an atmosphere of questioning that has crept in in spite of us—and which, perhaps, we are not desirous of excluding, but which we have not yet learned to handle and there is also that suspicion in the minds of so many that academic freedom means largely freedom for destructive criticisms, that prospective donors are not likely to be greatly impressed with an appeal made from the standpoint of the con-

tribution which the colleges make directly to the life of the church.

And yet we cannot help feeling that here is a sound basis for the appeal for church support of our church colleges, if it can be properly conceived and phrased. That proper conception of it is bound up with our definition of Christianity and of Christian education. If we conceive of Christianity in terms of a system of doctrine alone, to be transmitted from generation to generation with the accretions that it may gather from the experiences of succeeding generations, our own system in particular, we may not find it difficult to convince a portion of our constituency, but the majority of them will probably receive our plea with cold or, at best, lukewarm enthusiasm. We cannot feel that this conception of Christianity as accumulated culture will be found to be the best estimate of our faith, nor will we likely discover that this is the most potent in inducing those with money to give to part with some or all of it for the purposes of church college education. But if we conceive of Christianity as a creative force, potent in human life and conduct, it is possible that we shall have found a point of attack from which we shall go on to witness further and further interest in these institutions of the church, which, after all is said that can be said on the other side, are engaged in no other primary task than to make Christianity a creative force in the lives of the future leaders of humanity and, through them, in the lives of all humans.

And this brings us to a second great field, or area, in which the church college is a challenge to the church boards of education for the utmost of cooperation and support. This field may be expressed in terms of the fundamental character of the education which is to be, or, possibly, is being given in the church colleges. For the church colleges of today are confronted, as are all colleges, with a grave educational problem. It is the formulating of a philosophy and method of education. It is not necessary, of course, even to mention in such circles as these that educational thought and practice is in as chaotic a state at this time as ever perhaps in the history of education. This is not to be deplored entirely, except as to its effect upon

those who are the involuntary victims of our educational experiments. In spite of this, periods of experiment are necessary to progress. We live in an age of experiment. We are arguing fundamental theories of education. We are attempting multitudes of new methods in educational practice. Our right hand hardly has knowledge of what our left hand is doing. We seem to be trying to be all things to all people's children.

And the church college, of course, is caught in this maelstrom. It has gone serenely on its way in the past, thinking that education is culture, and behold, the rest of the educational world, apparently, has become convinced of the truth and inviolability of the utilitarian character of education. To them, education must produce in terms of dollars and cents. So the task to which the church college must give itself and in the doing of which it challenges the church board of education to the fullest cooperation and support is not to attempt to reconcile these two irreconcilable points of view, but to formulate a philosophy of education in which all the abiding values of a cultural education shall be conserved and a utilitarian character given to education, which will insure that it will not be lost in the Slough of Despond of current materialism. In a similar manner, it will be the part of the church college to crystallize a body of opinion that will recognize that the real thinker is a producer as well as the maker of motor cars, and that the man who may or may not serve in a "white collar job" can be as keenly interested as any in the things of the mind, or may find as great delight in the intricacies of a metaphysical or mathematical problem as any other, even though he may be serving with his hands in a position which today is considered menial, but which under the influence of an enlightened Christian philosophy of life is menial only as it is made so by the worker, or may be as glorious as the craft of any other because shot through with the ideals of a creative Christianity.

And this brings us to another great area in which the church college must operate and in which it challenges the church boards of education to the fullest cooperation and support. We refer here to the tremendous intellectual struggle that is in process to bring Christianity into direct, proper and useful re-

lations with the current scientific trend of practically all thought.

Church colleges have been established not infrequently for the purpose of shielding students from the devastating arrows of what has always been known as destructive heresy; we are witnessing in these days a recrudescence of this attitude to insure their indoctrination in the dogmas of the particular church which may have been instrumental in their founding; and to shield them in their beliefs so that they may retain their orthodoxy. But the shielding idea is not always successful. It is probably least successful today of any time in the history of man. Especially is it not likely to be successful then if entered upon now. There may have been a day when in an isolated college or university a student was limited to a certain type of reading and experiences. But, if so, that day is past. Today he is in touch with the world at all times. He eats the same brands of breakfast foods; he reads the news in the daily papers from the same sources; he looks at the same movies; he hears the same songs over the radio that the rest of his brothers in America and a large part of the world hear—and see and read and eat. He cannot be kept away from radical utterances or outpourings in any field, even in the field of religion. The world of criticism is serving its pabulum to him every day as to every one of his brothers. He is rapidly being standardized. If the process continues, constructive and independent thinking may perish from the earth.

If there are questions affecting the character, authenticity or value of the Bible he is made familiar with them. The whole machinery of society is organized to bring a knowledge of disquieting things to him as well as the knowledge of wholesome things. He knows the arguments against miracles before he ever takes Christian Evidences (if, indeed, he takes it). He knows that controversy is waging fiercely over the interpretation of Scripture. He hears the church spoken about critically and sees it ignored by the great mass of people, its priests and ministers ridiculed and its most sacred rites parodied. Religiously he is between the devil of materialism and the deep sea of naturalism.

His early instruction in religion has usually been by the method of impartation of ultimate truth accepted without question. He comes into college and finds that the approach to truth is made on a totally different basis. Nothing is settled, final or ultimate. Everything is scientifically arrived at. Positions are held subject always to review and revision in the light of further data. No wonder that he is confused. In the presence of the positiveness of science (in spite of its vehement protests to the contrary) he thinks himself confronted with a new and higher authority. He is shaken to his foundations. A period of struggle ensues. Sometimes he emerges with a new kind of faith. Sometimes he seems to emerge with no faith. Frequently he emerges with a conglomeration.

It looks at first sight as though the problem belongs to the church and should be solved by the training of the first tender years; that it should be of such a character as that not so much of it would have to be unlearned when the student comes to college. But the problem is the college's also. And if it is the college's problem, then it becomes the problem of the church boards of education. And so we come back to the starting point of our circle.

The college is not solving that problem by establishing courses in Bible or religion alone. The method of solution will have to go a great deal deeper than that. In some way, we shall have to produce a Christian philosophy that is as intellectually acceptable as a mechanistic one; that will present the eternal values as alluringly as the present one presents the materialistic ones; which will give to the world a real synthesis that looks at all things through the eyes of Him who said that if He could be lifted up before all men, He would draw all men into unity.

The University of Denver, an institution affiliated with the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has just been placed on the approved list of colleges and universities of the Association of American Universities.

WHAT MAY WE EXPECT FROM THE CHURCH-CONTROLLED COLLEGE?

PRESIDENT ARLO A. BROWN, Drew University

Our discussion this afternoon pertains especially to one group of colleges and universities,—namely, to those which are dominated if not actually controlled by a denomination of the Christian church.

Churches are not ends in themselves. They exist to serve. How effectively can they serve through their institutions of higher learning? What has the world a right to expect? If they cannot meet this expectation perhaps they should go out of the business of higher education. Some have seriously advocated that the churches abandon their colleges and hereafter invest the released time and money in aiding students who are attending tax-supported institutions. The problem is clearly an important one for all who are interested in higher education.

In the first place, we will all agree that the world has a right to expect a good quality of educational work. This sounds commonplace, but in some circles it would involve a radical change from present practice. Too often young people have been sent to a church college of inferior quality principally on account of denominational loyalty. Years ago a high school inspector from a state university, after watching a certain boy do his work in several classes, made the following comment: "That boy will go far if his parents do not make the mistake of sending him to a church college." But his parents did precisely that thing and the boy in this particular was probably helped rather than handicapped by their action. He has accomplished as much with his resources as he would have done if they had selected a different type of college. But they knew what they wanted. They desired to have their son secure the best possible intellectual training plus a strong faith in Jesus Christ, and a passion for service as a follower of Jesus Christ.

The needs of the students should be the first consideration of any college. It is important for the churches to be sufficiently jealous for the welfare of their students to see to it that their young people will be in no sense handicapped when they compete

in graduate schools or in business with those trained in other institutions which are recognized as the best in the land. The requirements of the proper standardizing bodies should be accepted as minimum standards to be raised just as rapidly as possible. Every college should aim to excel in some particulars. If the institution which charges high or moderate fees is not better in some respects for an individual student than those which charge little or no tuition, there is every reason why the student should save his tuition money to spend in some more profitable way.

Secondly, the world has a right to expect that the church-controlled school shall be loyal to Jesus Christ. Just how much this loyalty involves will depend upon the attitude of the particular denomination toward the educational policies of its colleges. Churches will differ in their interpretation of Jesus' person and of His teachings. They will also differ in the degree of freedom which they grant to their institutions. Some will ask their colleges to propagate certain creeds and to allow nothing to be said in the laboratories or classrooms which will disturb the students' acceptance of these creeds. Others will take the position that loyalty to the Master Teacher requires modern college teachers to do for the young what He would do if He were here. They accept confidently Jesus' own statements: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. . . . Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Hence they ask these teachers to lead the young in a reverent but eager search for the secrets about living, presenting in a fair way both sides of vital problems which are being investigated.

They recognize as true the statement by Dr. Peabody when he says: "The militancy of the church of the spirit is not so much subduing the world to the rule of Christ as the penetration of the world by the Spirit of Christ." That Jesus would desire to have these young people believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man they do not question. These churches expect the students in their colleges to make this article of faith a guiding factor in their lives. They also expect that most of them, unless they are followers of some other religion, will become devoted to the Christ as saviour and guide. They know that stu-

dents will differ considerably in their interpretation of the meaning of his saviourhood, because of differences in temperament and early religious training. In the best church colleges of the land today, Baptist, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic youths work together on the same campus with a common passion for Christian service while retaining the ties which bind them to denominations in which they were reared as children.

Some may suggest that this is a very weak form of loyalty to Christ for the colleges to practice, that unless these institutions try to win all students to accept the major beliefs of the controlling denomination the colleges are breaking faith with the churches which support them. But if this position is true then practically all fully accredited colleges must plead guilty of breaking faith. We all welcome Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and others into our schools. The most of our teachers hope that they will return to their home communities more useful to their particular communions than ever before. All churches engage in the effort to win adherents, but for the most part they confine their attention to those who are not already active in some other church. So far as the writer knows, colleges have seldom if ever been established for the purpose of directly winning converts. There seems to be clearly a place for what someone has called a "non-proselyting Christianity," and the institutions of higher learning whether church or state-controlled should provide for such.

The aim of these schools is to seek truth, to share the experiences of the teachers with those of the young people in a quest for what Jesus called "the abundant life." Teachers should express honestly their religious convictions when the occasion calls for such, but they should not try to force the students to believe as they do. If the example and reasoning of the instructor as he explains these convictions wins the allegiance of the students, naturally, that is well; but no "forced feeding" of religious convictions should be tolerated. The curriculum may properly contain courses which set forth denominational points of view. Chapel and other addresses may do the same. However, these should not be "required" of the conscientious objector.

The colleges and universities can render a finer service to Jesus Christ by other methods than those of propaganda. Ignorance concerning the meaning of His life and teachings is one of the most baffling handicaps to the development of the Kingdom of God on earth. And the Christian college can do much to remove this handicap. The greatest peril of the moment to the extension of Jesus' way of living does not lie in direct opposition to His teachings, nor in any discoveries of science, but to a tendency in some influential circles to ignore Him. When a renowned teacher had completed a series of lectures on education in the field of morals without mentioning Jesus, someone asked the lecturer why he made no reference to the Teacher of Galilee. He replied promptly, so we are told, "I would have done so if I had thought about it." Many students in the field of morals may reject the influence of Jesus, but it is difficult to see how any one with a passion for scientific inquiry into all of the factors modifying character should be unable to discover in Jesus any significant influence. A celebrated scientist once explained why he had left God out of his book on the nature of the universe, by saying, "I did not need that hypothesis." His friend replied, "Nevertheless, that would have been a useful hypothesis." Surely school men can all agree that the life and teachings of Jesus have had enough influence upon the lives of men to be a useful topic for study.

The students of Harvard pleaded this case convincingly in their survey of 1926 when they asked for a study of the "philosophy of Christianity" in a required course. We would not discredit either the honesty or the ability of teachers who are convinced that Jesus offers to the world no useful basis for ethical conduct. Nevertheless, we suggest that every college student who has not investigated these matters carefully is going into life handicapped by his ignorance about one of the factors which is powerfully influencing the conduct of millions of people throughout the world.

Professor Rogers of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology seems to have been right when he contended that the young people of today are not so much irreligious as they are ignorant.

They have no intellectual training which enables them to settle their religious problems adequately. . . . Our American Protestant boys and girls are as little interested in ideas of religion and social ethics as they are in politics and social science. They seem to have no ideas on which to build. They have received no training in these matters in school and apparently none in their churches.

The idea of teaching the Christian religion in so open-minded a way that people of all religious faiths may study it with profit does not preclude teaching in elective courses about the doctrines of a particular church, its program, or its methods of administration. The college of liberal arts should make provision for such aspects of leadership training as the denomination and the constituency need. This will not make the college a vocational rather than a cultural institution. It will rather enrich the program of culture by an investigation of such fields as comparative religions, church history, and principles of religious education.

In a College of Missions or a graduate School of Theology such courses will receive special attention, but even in a school specializing in the preparing of professional leadership for a particular denomination the curriculum should have so much variety, and the spirit of inquiry should be so tolerant that students belonging to other churches may also receive profitable training within its halls.

The world has a right to expect that the college will serve loyally the community in which it is located. If the institution is located in Peking, Tokyo or Bareilly it should strive persistently to meet the definite needs of these communities and of the larger constituency which looks to these centers for guidance. If the institution is located in Chattanooga, or in Gooding, Idaho, or in Northern New Jersey, it should do the same. Unless a school can serve in some vital ways the constituency in the territory immediately adjacent, it would seem to be either poorly located or badly managed. We ask an ever increasing amount of support from the adjacent communities, irrespective of denominational loyalties, and we should give in return an increasing amount of service.

At the same time such an institution should prove its loyalty to the church by providing definitely for such forms of training

as the denomination asks. Trained ministers are a necessity to any church: the denomination will indicate whether or not it expects a particular school to give professional training to its ministers. Trained laymen are just as necessary, and the developments of recent years indicate that institutions of higher learning are generally recognizing this obligation. Not many years ago Dr. Athearn had little difficulty in proving that the church-controlled colleges were making more definite provision to supply teachers to the public schools than they were to prepare teachers of religion for the local church schools. However, that condition is changing rapidly, for practically every strong Christian college is definitely training laymen for positions of leadership in the local church. Except for a small requirement in Bible the courses are elective and the enrolment in them as a rule is relatively small, but the work is carefully done.

These then seem to be the marks of a high grade church-controlled college expressed in terms of four loyalties:—loyalty to the needs of the students to be shown by the achievement of high standards of excellence in educational procedure; loyalty to Jesus Christ to be evidenced by developing in students the spirit, the ideals, the knowledge, and the habits of living which Jesus would seek to develop if He were once more a teacher in human form; loyalty to the community in which it is located to be shown by producing in as many respects as possible the type of citizen which the community needs; loyalty to the church to be proved by many forms of service, and especially by training laymen and ministers for leadership in the local church.

The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and the United Lutheran Board of Education report increased enrolments for their affiliated colleges. The Methodist Episcopal Board reports enrolment of thirty-eight Methodist colleges at practically the same figure as last year. The total enrolment in Methodist colleges and universities exceeds that of last year by 6,571, but the increase of 6,550 in *university* enrolment is practically the entire advance.

FELLOWSHIP AND FAITH*

CHAPLAIN RAYMOND C. KNOX, Columbia University

And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.—*Epistle to the Hebrews*, 11: 39-40.

In the fabric of life the great pattern which is woven on the loom of time is that of fellowship. Generations come and go; material conditions flourish and cease to be; thoughts and conceptions have their sway and are displaced by new. But in the process the bond by which men are united in fellowship is made strong and abides. With increasing clearness we see in fellowship the design of a Master Mind, Who in all the tangled threads of life foresaw the beauty in which each strand should have its place. To recognize the fellowship of men in which we have our share is to penetrate into the deepest meaning of life. Apart from them our life has no significance—a broken thread that is cast aside. Unless our labor is joined with that of many others, our work is futile and does not endure. To see life steadily and to see it whole is to have the understanding that we are members of a glorious fellowship engaged in a common task, composed of the generations of those who toiled for it in the years that are gone, recruited in the presence of all who strive for the same high aim, and to be added to in the future by an innumerable company who, inspired by the one purpose, will complete the pattern which the ages disclose.

It is this conception of life as a fellowship which is expressed in the verse: "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." In a glowing summary the writer of the Epistle recounts the lives of the great heroes of the faith. Foremost among them was one who had the hardihood to venture, to journey into an unknown land, seeking a city that had lasting foundations. Another was a fearless leader, gifted with insight, who delivered

* Address delivered in St. Paul's Chapel at the service commemorating the One Hundred and Seventy-Fifth Anniversary, Columbia University, October 27th, 1929.

his people from servitude, and laid the basis of society in law. There were those who had subdued kingdoms and enlarged the boundaries of human freedom. All had wrought righteousness, faced hardships, made sacrifices; and some had met violent death. But greater still than what they did was what they strove for. They had accomplished much, but their highest glory was in beginning a work which would extend through the ages, whose larger fulfilment their eyes would not see. In this undertaking they showed their faith, by which they obtained a good report. For it was their faith which gave to their deeds true worth and significance, which made them memorable. Because they had the vision, the faith, to look forward into the future, to launch an enterprise which they confidently committed to later generations to complete, the fame of their names was forever assured.

Here is no false philosophy of history which sets the ages in seeming conflict; no suggestion of a restraining dead-hand to hinder progress; no timid warning never to depart from prescribed ways and to act in the light of fuller knowledge. Rather is it seen that through all the ages men are united in the fellowship of a continuing task, that for each generation to advance it further with all the resources it can command is the vital bond. For underneath, and sustaining this fellowship, there is the faith in the boundless provision of God, who ever has for men some surpassing good in store, and by whose aid all effort will finally attain to the perfection which from the beginning was sought.

In this spirit, with the recognition that we are members of a continuing community to whom is committed an ennobling and inspiring task, we commemorate in this service the founding of Columbia University, one hundred and seventy-five years ago. Today we recall the lives of those by whom the plans were first drawn and the foundations laid. They, also, were men who faced difficulties, made sacrifices, and wrought righteousness. Living at a time of settlement in a new land when a nation was to be built, they saw the necessity of providing for the cultural and spiritual life of man. Taking the slender resources which they possessed, they made the venture, and on October 31, 1754, Kings College, as it then was called, "for instruction and education of youth in the learned languages and the liberal arts and

sciences," was born. But that which gave to their work its lasting significance, its supreme worth, was their faith, through which they obtained a good report. For they, too, looked beyond their present far into the distant future. They had the conviction that the undertaking which they had begun would expand and grow into something greater than their eyes would behold. They did not hesitate to commit to those who should come after them the legacy of that larger fulfilment. They had the trust that in the providence of God there was some better thing in store, which, as it was won, would perfect their labors, through the solidarity of an endless fellowship.

Instruction in Kings College was first given by a single teacher, who was chosen President, Doctor Samuel Johnson, distinguished scholar. In the vestry-room of Trinity Church he met a company of seven students. Yet, even then he prepared a statement setting forth in amazing summary the full range of instruction which the College was destined to offer. So firm was the grasp of his intellectual foresight, so undaunted his faith, that in the University which has since been reared, with its instruction staff and student enrolment reaching into the thousands, doing its work in a world of scientific discovery and social circumstance of which no one could dream—yet all that is now done may be viewed as the greater thing for which the founders strove.

Time would fail adequately to mention the names of those who, sharing the same vision, devoted their talents and energies to the upbuilding of the College in the early years of its history. They are names which are indelibly written in every outstanding event in the developing life of the nation. With each passing decade the edifice of tradition was enlarged and adorned by the labor of many lives: ever the ideal has remained, a living heritage, richer and more vital as the years go by. As Ruskin said of the cathedral builders of Europe, "they left us their adoration," so we may say of the builders of Columbia, "they left us their faith and their fellowship."

In no sphere do we have a more profound and vivid sense of a community of spirit than in the religious work of the University. From the outset provisions were made for the cultivation and expression of the religious life. These measures were con-

ceived in liberty. Formulated in a time when controversy was rife, they were finally lifted above the level of a narrow partisanship. Services of worship, taken from the dignified liturgy of an historic Church, were to embody the fundamental faith of all communions, and to promote a true catholicity. "That the people may be better satisfied in sending their children for education to this college," wrote President Johnson, "it is understood that, as to religion, there is no intention to impose upon the scholars the tenets of any particular set of Christians, but to inculcate . . . the great principles of Christianity and morality in which true Christians of each denomination are generally agreed." And in the Charter, equal liberties, privileges and benefits are guaranteed to all, teachers and students, without discrimination as to creed.

In the expansion from a small college to a complex university these aims and principles have been the pole-star by which the course has been steered. A chapel of stately beauty has been built of which it has been said, "Religion can be learned from it, as well as in it." Courses in religion, tracing its creative influence in the culture and history of every people, open to all who desire to study the subject with the freedom and thoroughness that lead to mastery, now have their established place. A theological seminary, independent of denominational control yet ministering to all the churches, fulfills the forecast of Alexander Hamilton. A college of staunch church loyalty is a welcome member in the academic fellowship. Concord and cooperation are inculcated in deed no less than in study and worship. Students now come to us of differing religious inheritance, from every land and of every race. We believe that here it can be demonstrated that religion is a bond of sympathy and understanding among them and not a cause of division and controversy. A staff of competent advisers to religious organizations stimulate student initiative, and the field is found to be white unto the harvest.

But the goal lies still ahead. The vision of the greater thing which God has in store is to be our guide in the onward march. In the first announcement by President Johnson in which he speaks of the aims of the College, there is this striking statement:

And finally, he says, the design is to lead those who come to it "from the study of nature to the knowledge of themselves, and of the God of nature, their duty to Him, themselves, and one another, and everything that can contribute to their true happiness, both here and hereafter." Can we not now translate this, our supreme commission, into terms of our thought, see what it implies, realize the means available to advance to this end? Shall we not have the insight rightly to interpret the life and activity of our University today so that we perceive that this purpose of knowing the Living God was not alone the aspiration of a past age, but that it likewise expresses our aim and the true object of our search?

To comprehend how every activity of the University contributes to this end, two things are necessary. The first is to have the insight of faith fully to recognize the high office of intelligence in leading to a knowledge of God. We know that "intellectual and moral growth is an undivided process." No one can cultivate a vigorous religious life in an air-tight compartment from which the mind is shut out. When knowledge is possible, "ignorance is not innocence, but sin." "Ye shall know the truth," says Christ, "and the truth shall make you free." If such is our faith, if with Christ we believe that by the power of truth life shall be made free, then every institution devoted to liberating the mind from ignorance and prejudice, to widening the circle of understanding of the world in which we live, to penetrating farther into the surrounding mystery, is an appointed means for performing the task which He sets before us. If with Christ we believe that God is revealed in truth, then every exercise of the intelligence by which we better apprehend truth brings us into clearer knowledge of His ways and His laws. The first of the great commandments is to love God with all the mind as well as with the heart and soul; and the way to love God with the mind is to use it, with all the diligence and strength of which we are capable.

In the wide range of Columbia's intellectual life we see, therefore, the ultimate aim for which Kings College was designed nobly served and upheld. As Professor Shotwell discriminatingly declared in his Commemoration Address, delivered from this pul-

pit, "The work of a university in which the intelligence of the best minds is directed upon the fundamental problems of life, is itself religious, not figuratively, but intrinsically." It becomes one with faith, for faith, as Thomas Aquinas has defined it, is "courage of the spirit which projects itself forward, confident of finding the truth."

Having this courage we eagerly hail every advancing discovery. Herein is one of the great lessons which we especially learn from the history of this University. In so doing we share in the spirit and outlook of the men whom we remember and honor. For they were men whose minds were receptive to discovery, who were themselves pioneers. When Doctor Johnson was a tutor at Yale, it is said that he was a "chief influence" in making known the larger conception of the universe associated with the name of Copernicus. In our time the Copernican conception has been displaced by a view vaster and more majestic: of a universe whose distances are measured by the light-year; man is seen in a new perspective. And the imperative need is for those who will be a "chief influence" in mediating these discoveries, who will show their significance for our spiritual life, and so lead us into a larger knowledge of God.

When this chapel was erected the explanation was given as to why it was called St. Paul's Chapel. In every building, in classroom and laboratory, it was pointed out, truth is sought. Here, in reverent worship, this devotion is seen in its personal relationship to God, in Whose Light we see Light. Thus to all who by seeking truth give evidence that they are searchers after God, however unconsciously, the words of St. Paul are fitly applicable, "Him declare I unto you!"

And to perceive the manner of fulfilling our highest heritage, we need as well the insight of faith to discern the divine character of all human ministry. Inscribed over the pillars of the Library, on the "brow" of the University, the purpose for which Columbia was founded is forever affirmed:

. . . For the advancement of the public good and the glory of Almighty God.

It is only a superficial distinction which sees in this proclamation two separate aims. In essence, the two aspects are one and

indivisible. For it was the teaching of Him Who reveals to us God that every deed of helpfulness to men is to do God service. He so identified Himself with all human need that He spoke of every considerate act as rendered unto Him. His own life was spent not in being ministered unto, but in ministering. He proclaimed as the new standard of greatness the contribution each man makes, and declared that in conforming to it men become perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect. He set before us the ideal of all mankind united in sympathy, mutual service, and good will, and He called its realization the reign of God upon earth.

Within these one hundred and seventy-five years, who can estimate the far extent and the manifold variety of achievement that have made for the advancement of the public good! It is the glory of Columbia that she has ever freely consecrated to this ideal all her resources and her unstinted energy: in the instruction carried on day by day; in the personal participation of her members in every form of civic betterment; in bringing to bear upon the perplexing problems of society the illumination of experience and accurate knowledge; and no less has she kept before men the vision without which the people perish. Actuated by this spirit and skilfully trained, her graduates are found in every land, as she now directs her gaze and theirs toward the dawn of a day when men shall live and work together in enduring peace.

To see in this human ministry the acceptable service of God, even as Christ taught, is to know the true nature of the work in which Columbia is engaged. It is to perceive that her achievements are rooted in permanence. It is to possess the power which overcomes all obstacles, and which dispels the feeling that man's efforts are vain and lead him nowhere. It sets before each individual the rational goal for which to strive, calling for the enlistment of all his capacities. It relates each man's life in mystic union with God by enabling him to share in His eternal purpose. It is to greet the fellowship of the University as the symbol, the prototype, of that larger community which it is her mission to create, till it embrace all nations of the earth and God's Kingdom is come.

With gratitude and with courage we dedicate ourselves anew to the faith and to the fellowship of the University of our affec-

tion and our hope. Into the labors of those who saw the vision and were not disobedient to it, we have entered. The fruition of their dreams we are permitted in large measure to see. Encompassed by a host of witnesses, we press forward to the mark of the high calling, keeping the faith that God has some greater thing in store, that through an endless fellowship the work of all shall be made perfect.

The world has not suffered from absence of ideals and spiritual aims anywhere nearly as much as it has from absence of means for realizing those which it has prized in a literary and sentimental way. Technique is still a novelty in most matters, and like most novelties is played with for a while on its own account. But it will be used for ends beyond itself some time; and I think that interest in technique is precisely the thing which is most promising in our civilization, the thing which in the end will break down devotion to external standardization and the mass-quantity ideal. For its application has not gone far as yet, and interest in it is still largely vicarious, being that, so to say, of the spectator rather than of naturalization in general use. In the end, technique can signify only emancipation of individuality, and on a broader scale than anything obtaining in the past.—*John Dewey.*

The purpose of science is to develop without prejudice or preconception of any kind a knowledge of the facts, the laws, and the processes of nature. The even more important task of religion, on the other hand, is to develop the consciences, the ideals, and the aspirations of mankind.—R. A. MILLIKAN, *Science and Life*, p. 42.

A COMMUNITY SCHOOL OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

PRESIDENT EMERITUS W. O. THOMPSON

The Akron, Ohio, Council of Churches reports that one hundred Protestant churches occupy the city of Akron and that one hundred of them are participating in the Council of Churches. Sixty of these churches are represented in the program of religious education which opened October 21 and continues until the holidays.

The writer had the privilege of delivering the opening address on the evening of October 21st. The weather was wet and the streets sloppy but more than six hundred persons assembled in the Grace Reformed Church for the opening meeting of the autumn. There were two hundred and fifty advance registrations. It was expected that the complete registration would go beyond six hundred. This is the third or fourth year of this enterprise. The program for the evening always includes a general lecture and at 8:25 P. M. the audience is divided into classes according to their own registration. The evening closes at fifteen minutes past nine. There are twelve distinct divisions in which courses of study are offered. The junior department, the adult department and such divisions as adolescent psychology, the psychology of teaching, church school administration and principles of religious education and Christianity and social ideals.

In the faculty are found the superintendent of the city schools, one of the high school principals, the dean of the College of Education from the University of Akron and Dean Thomas W. Graham of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin. In addition to these, certain ministers have undertaken to carry specific courses in which their own major interest lies.

It is worth while probably to name the objectives as stated in the bulletin: "To create a deeper consciousness of the educational ministry and responsibility of the church. To develop a more efficient and adequate staff of church school leaders who shall guide the childhood, youth and adults of our community toward the achievement of Christian character.

In support of these ideals and in fact in support of the whole program is the active cooperation of all ministers of the city manifesting a unity not often approached in any of our modern cities. The experience in other years has been so fruitful as to develop an increasing interest from year to year. One can not quite measure the spiritual value to six hundred or more people taking seriously the study of the current problems in religious education. The appeal is made to members of the adult classes in the city, to teacher training groups, to church officers and Sunday school teachers and to younger people who are willing to become teachers in the Sunday school. The organization therefore looks toward a steady replacement of those who retire by reason of death or removal, by a well prepared group of younger men and women whose instruction has developed their interest in the church and in young people.

It may be well to note, in passing, that the standards of teaching are all subject to approval by the International Council of Religious Education in order to secure credit. This tie-up with the International Council on the part of the city demonstrates the importance of the work recently undertaken by the International Council through its committee on education. It is desirable that there should be a widespread knowledge of the fact that the International Council is administering the question of standards of education with conscience and courage.

One can not fail to admire the spirit manifest in the Akron Council of Churches. Upon reflection, however, there does not seem to be much in Akron that could not be discovered in many other cities if we had a spiritual Christopher Columbus. The truth is that the rank and file of the church is more interested in an intelligent study of the Scriptures than ever before. We are not aware of how widespread the interest is in the discussion of problems in religion arising from the study of modern psychology.

One is encouraged when he sees the tendency toward an organization of courses of instruction looking toward the better preparation of specific classes, such as the primary department, boys' division, or other classifications. The teachers actual, or

in preparation, of these divisions impress upon the entire church the importance of organizing the teaching function of the church in a systematic and effective way. This itself is a definite advance in the improvement of our Sunday school programs.

One desires also to commend the enthusiastic interest shown by men and women representing the educational interests of the city and of nearby colleges and universities. These people have demonstrated the fact of the responsibility of the church for its own activities and particularly for the teachings of the church. The teaching function of the church has too long been left to voluntary effort supported by a very conscientious but highly individualistic preparation. It is a gratifying fact that in these days as many as sixty churches in one city will contribute its teachers and leaders to a school of religious education under the auspices of the City Council of Churches. This cannot fail to produce a deepened sense of unity, a willingness to cooperate in the community problems as expressed in the church and Sunday school, and in increasing regard for the quality of the Christian life represented in communions other than that to which one gives his allegiance.

As intimated, the devotion of the teaching profession to a community program of this kind is worthy of high commendation and no doubt receives the grateful appreciation of the six hundred or more registrants in Akron.

In a word, it may be said that there are a great many people in the country quite willing to expend some energy and to go to some expense of time and preparation provided we can show them a place where this energy and time gives reasonable hope of being fruitful. One of the valid and frequently heard objections to the church has been that it furnished no program challenging the youth. The writer has known young men and young women who have grown into indifference through idleness. Is it not possible for the modern city to unite its forces, as in Akron for example, and to work out a program that will challenge the talent of the young men and young women who have graduated from our colleges and universities? Every city has scores and many of them hundreds of these young men and young women who are

spiritually indifferent, not seeing any opportunity for a harvest. Where is the city organized to utilize willing graduates of our colleges in an educational program with spiritual objectives? It is a sad commentary upon the great centers of population with the multitude of churches to find no organization dealing with the incoming tide from year to year of college graduates from the entire country. Many of these are well grounded in education and religion, poor in purse, willing in spirit but lacking in any facilities of organization or utilization. The church is willing, but for some reason has not developed a program that provides for a challenging life to these young people.

Here is one opportunity and possibly a large task.

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES BULLETIN

The issues of the Association of American Colleges BULLETIN for November and December contain a significant commentary upon the problem of teacher training which has been at the fore in the programs of the recent annual meetings of the Council and Association, under the topic—"Educating the Educators." The November issue presents the reaction of the Graduate Schools—letters on their polity and program from twenty-eight Deans; the December issue presents the "In-Service Training of Young College Teachers" by executives of Association Colleges.

The Association BULLETINS also contain two unusually informing articles of interest to readers of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. One, entitled "Fifty-five New College Presidents," introduces the men and women who have accepted the heavy responsibilities of office during the past year (November); the other is the abridgment of a doctor's thesis on "Social and Religious Influences in the Small Denominational College," concerning which the General Secretary of one of the constituent boards of the Council wrote: "It is an intimate study of the situation which obtains in the smaller colleges of the Middle States. The data were gathered in a very careful way and represent the situation in fifteen typical institutions. I regard the study as of very great value" (December).

UNION OF THE CONGREGATIONAL AND CHRISTIAN CHUCHES

REVEREND ALFRED W. HURST
Pastor, Elon College Church

October 25, 1929, was an historic day for the Christian Church of the United States. On that day the General Convention of the Christian Church in session at Piqua, Ohio, adopted a proposal for union with the Congregational Churches without a dissenting voice. The plan of union was drawn up by the Christian unity commissions of the two bodies and was the result of several years of conference, planning, and educating the two bodies involved in the plan of union. The National Council of Congregational Churches in session at Detroit last May adopted the plan unanimously. Therefore the unanimous vote of the Christian Churches at Piqua actually brought into existence The General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches (unincorporated). The adoption of the following resolution consummated the union:

That the National Council of Congregational Churches and the General Convention of the Christian Church be united under the title of the General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches (unincorporated) looking toward complete union as soon as necessary legal steps can be taken, both national bodies to continue for the time being their organizations to meet legal requirements, while constituting the general membership of the organization. (Invitation is extended to other bodies to join this union. In the event of favorable action by one or more national bodies it is agreed that a new and more inclusive name shall be chosen for the General Council.)

That the basis of the new relation shall be the recognition by each group that the other group is constituted of the followers of Jesus Christ. Each individual church and each group of churches shall be free to retain and develop its own form of expression. Finding in the Bible the supreme rule of faith and life, but recognizing that there is wide room for differences of interpretation among equally good christians, this union shall be conditioned upon the acceptance of Christianity as primarily a way of life, and not upon uniformity of theological opinion or any uniform practice of ordinances.

The union proposal was the chief item of interest in the Convention at Piqua. Other matters of importance were considered but the union matter would not be kept down; it was mentioned in practically every report, address and item of business. This was only natural for the Christian denomination has preached Christian unity through all of its history, to be realized some day in organic form, and here was an opportunity to put into practice that which it had preached for one hundred and thirty-five years. The hour had arrived for a body of Christian people to express themselves on a matter of far reaching import. The atmosphere was electric. Deep emotion was evident; and yet back of it lay years of thinking and planning. They had thought it through before they went to Piqua; they were anxious to act. Once more a body of Christian people were conscious of standing on the frontier and feeling the thrill of a pioneering effort. Those who previously had opposed the plan altered their attitude after they heard the plan more fully explained on the floor, thus making it possible to adopt the proposal without a dissenting vote. After the vote was taken the vast audience of people stood and sang with new meaning and exaltation "Blest Be The Tie That Binds Our Hearts In Christian Love." In that moment Jesus Christ stood supreme in the thought and loyalty of His people. They recognized that "organization is important, finance is important, publication is important, a name is important, but Jesus Christ is more important." For once the denominational mind stepped aside and made way for the mind of Christ.

The result of such a merging of Christian forces no one can anticipate with certainty but Christian faith dares to believe in greater things. As President Coffin said in his address, "If the Spirit of God can lead in the achievements of the past in a divided church, what can it not do in a united church?" The common opinion seems to be that a new chapter has been opened in the history of the church in the United States, the significance of which will be felt around the world.

The action at Piqua was a great adventure. President Coffin expressed his opinion: "We have either killed a church or made possible a more glorious future for it." In spite of cau-

tion there remains still the risk which always attends a great venture. But the risk of union does not approximate the risk of the denominational system, if it is true as Dr. Peter Ainslie said, that "if the Protestants of the world do not get together, Protestantism is doomed; if Protestants and Catholics of the world do not get together, Christianity is doomed!"

So far as the immediate relation of the two bodies is concerned, this is an enlarged fellowship, but the hopes and desires which guided these two bodies in their action were for an enlarging fellowship. While this is the first instance of the union of two denominations of distinctive origin in the United States, it is not regarded as a final achievement. Bishop McConnell and Dr. Ainslie both expressed the faith that while these two denominations had gone ahead and made a path, others would follow. It was stated specifically in the plan of union that "invitation is extended to other bodies to join this union," in which event a name more descriptive of the inclusive basis of membership would be chosen. Indeed this union is regarded as "one minor event in the great Divine event toward which all Christians must move in making the brethren all one."

There were held the last year on college campuses a total of eighty Christian World Education Institutes with 50,000 students and professors taking part. During the month of February alone there were some fifty Christian World Education conferences held in different parts of the country.

Many able speakers gave freely of their services for the conferences but an especially encouraging feature was the way the students both planned and carried out these institutes. For instance, in Indiana 150 students from different colleges were on the planning committees and more than 10,000 students were influenced by the programs in that one state.

The Board of Education of the United Presbyterian Church of North America has made a survey of the theological schools of that Church (see Annual Report of the General Secretary, 1929), and is now engaged in a study of the Departments of Bible in the five colleges affiliated with the Board.

RELIGIOUS SYMPOSIUM AT COLUMBIA**HERBERT E. EVANS**

An interesting religious symposium was conducted at Columbia University during two weeks in the month of October. The symposium was arranged by the staff of religious advisors who are university officers representing Catholic, Protestant and Jewish groups.

On Tuesday, October 9, the speaker was Father Francis P. Duffy, Chaplain of the Rainbow Division, who spoke on the Catholic conception of religion. On Wednesday the speaker was Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, who covered the theme of personal religious problems. On Thursday the speaker was Rabbi Stephen Wise of the Free Synagogue of New York City. In the following week on Tuesday, October 16, Father Wilfred Parsons, Editor of the magazine *America*, spoke; on Wednesday Dr. Fosdick was again a speaker and on Thursday Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, of the Jewish Institute of Religion, spoke.

The symposium was a discussion of modern religious problems and after each address time was given for questions. The average attendance of these meetings was four hundred students a day. Apparently from the results of this symposium there is a need in American colleges and universities for the presentation of the basic facts of various religious groups. Columbia will later conduct a symposium of short meetings where speakers representing the most conservative and most liberal view-points in world religion will present their views.

The reverend Father George B. Ford has been appointed by Columbia University as the religious advisor to Catholic students. Father Ford succeeds Father Elliot Ross, who is now on the staff of the School of Religion at the University of Iowa.

THE CALVERT ROUND TABLE SEMINAR AT HARVARD

RAYMOND H. LEACH

Under the auspices of The Calvert Round Table of Boston there was held at Harvard University on November 12 and 13, 1929, a Seminar to study the relations of Catholics, Jews and Protestants; to face frankly and to deal in a friendly way with the causes and effects of the conflict between Catholics, Jews, and Protestants in our social order.

The Calvert Round Table is an organization composed of a membership limited to one hundred—including those of the various Christian religions and of the Jewish faith in approximately even proportion.

The object of Calvert Round Table as given in the by-laws is:

"To uphold the freedom of worship guaranteed by the Constitution, to remove religious prejudice, and to foster among all our people, of whatever religious belief, the respect for each other's sincere convictions, mutual confidence and good will essential to the perpetuation of the Republic.

"To encourage the younger men to identify themselves more frequently and more intimately with their fellow citizens of other religions in civic movements."

In order that the organization may be of real service and may accomplish as nearly as possible its objectives, it is stipulated in the by-laws that, "No one active in political life or holding elective public office shall be eligible for membership."

The Seminar held at Harvard was patterned after the one held at Columbia University, January 30 and 31, 1929, under the auspices of the National Conference of Jews and Christians, and as a matter of fact is an outgrowth of the Columbia Seminar.

Calvert Round Table Program

Table No. 1—"Vocational Adjustment," George W. Coleman, Chairman.

Table No. 2—"Misrepresentation of Religious Beliefs and Practices," Professor Harrison S. Elliott, Chairman.

Table No. 3—"Community Conflict and Cooperation," Professor John J. Mahoney, Chairman.

On the afternoon of the final day of the Seminar there was a general discussion at which reports were made by the chairman of each of the three Round Tables, followed by summarized discussion.

Interfaith Seminars of this order are very heartening for they cannot fail to aid in the solution of serious problems and to promote mutual understanding and respect among all three of the participating groups.

At Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida, April 19-21, was held "An Intercollegiate Parley on Religion and the Modern World." The meeting was held with the hope of clearing up some of the misunderstandings between Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews. The chief speakers were outstanding men of the three faiths:—Rabbi Goldman, Father J. Elliot Ross, Professor William Adams Brown, and Professor Kruse. Two students and one professor from each of fifty-eight colleges were invited to attend as delegates.

CAPITAL FUNDS FOR Y. W. C. A.

The Young Women's Christian Association of Lewiston-Auburn, Maine, has recently issued a leather bound booklet, entitled "Capital Funds for Young Women's Christian Association of Lewiston-Auburn." This contains forms and pamphlets for the use of lawyer and client, which explain the details of building up endowment funds for this Association, as gifts absolute, living trusts, life insurance trusts, with forms of endowment certificates and bequests.

This set of pamphlets is similar to sets which have been issued by a dozen colleges of the country, adapted, however, in phrasing, in description and historical statements and in forms of appeal to the uses of the Young Women's Christian Association. It makes use of methods which have been approved by the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters and its cooperating organizations.

A UNIVERSITY PROGRAM IN RELIGION

DR. E. W. BLAKEMAN

Director of the Wesley Foundation, Berkeley, California

The average college student is about as religious as he is healthy. He is idealistic, trustful, heroic, social, happy and self-sacrificing. With the possible exception of being unified, he has all the virtues which we use to rate a person as religious. In fact, the average student is too much engrossed in the adventure of life to know that he has possibilities of evil, and contains germs which might destroy him soul and body. I make this statement knowing that drinking is all too common; that an occasional couple mistakes lust for love, that campus politics ruins our social ideals; that God is profaned by word and phrase almost habitually; that the sanctuary is avoided and the altar ignored by most of our students. We do not mean to evade the strict meaning of words. Student youth are religious in this sense—they are bent on attaining communion with that which they imagine to be the highest and holiest reality attainable. The teacher of religion or the counselor who begins at this point may hope to be useful over a period of years in the midst of university students. All others enter the field at their peril, for students are severe critics. Religion is a major in the experience of the race. It is as universal as man and to him as elemental as life itself. This gives us our broad basis of religion where Jew, Catholic, Protestant may meet. On this the state university itself can enter without serious interference as to legality.

When we come to the Christian religion, as we of the Federal Council group understand it, we have some further questions. Religion and the principles of Jesus are not identical. Not many of our students are Christians. The Christian religion is specific. God is a definite sort of God. This universe according to Jesus' revelations has a very definite purpose in and through it. Man's spiritual destiny is a high one. Attainment of a certain dynamic spirit is paramount. A unity is expected. Aspirations of the heart and conduct of life are wrapped in one tight ball of interrelation if we properly read our Gospels.

Students that I meet, for the most part reared in the church, are painfully ignorant on this subject. Most of them can recognize the true Christian act. Very few have an understanding of the laws of spiritual growth. They come to us from a training remote from the point. They are the victims of an inadequate home and a faulty church. Our Christianity seems to be institutionalized out of all perspective. At least, it functions in a field remote from what I mean by spiritual growth. New families in the average town are grist for two or more denominational hoppers. Talent is viewed as the power we mobilize to turn the heavy wheels of divided Protestantism. We are proficient in constituency rolls, parish statistics and meetings. But these skills are not those which advance a child in the Kingdom of God. Such skills often fail to make faith attractive. They seldom enlist our most thoughtful sons. They fail to introduce the joys and satisfactions of Christian culture. As a result our leakage is appalling.

For example, it is confidently reported that our university pastors dealing with Methodist students find the constituency divided as follows. Of those who upon entering the university record their church preference or membership in the Methodist Church, one-third dropped out of vital contact with the church during the grade school experience. One-third dropped out during the high school period. One-third of the constituency, upon reaching the college gate, is in some way in touch with the home church. In other words, we have records, not loyalties, chance contacts not vital relations, historic traces not dynamic creative partnerships. Assuming that other pastors are in about the same case,—then, two-thirds of *our students* are *not ours* at all. Hence the denominational basis is a misnomer even used statistically, at which point denominational Christianity is at its best. At present we start with a one-third constituency. I regret to report that we finish the senior year even farther reduced.

Where, then, shall we begin? The problems are many and varied. Allow me to call attention to three of them: (1) Serve university purpose rather than denominational purpose. (2) A staff on the basis of function not affiliation. (3) Complete the educational opportunity (a department of religion).

I. UNIVERSITY PURPOSE

What of a university purpose? No pastor says to himself, "Now I am going to serve my denomination." What happens is this. I inherit a plant owned by my denomination and not inhabited by others. I meet a constituency coherent, well-integrated and congenial. I get my salary from that congenial constituency. I talk their language with ease. To talk the language and appreciate the methods of another constituency takes effort. When I least suspect it, I most certainly fall into a church-mindedness. The church and the university are at different tasks. The church seeks worshipers. That is her glory. The university seeks understanding through the exercise of the critical faculty. In this she rises supreme. Now, there are pastors among students who do not worship less because they criticize more. Only such are apt to bring able students to worship or induce young and promising scholars to enter into religion by faith.

We have in Berkeley many religious agents. If we were all seeking to serve the *university purpose* rather than some denominational purpose we would have a religious education program as comprehensive for our field as the geology department has for its field. We would be going as deep in given subjects within our field as the literature professors go in literature. We would be closely articulated. We would enjoy a central enrolment record of all the students. We would put forth a single publication for all students, offer attractive assemblies to introduce our religion to scholars and would provide lectures such as would engage faculty and students. With such thoroughness we would finally be able to continue through the university *each freshman* who came to *any* counselor, or took a course with *any* teacher or worshiped at *any* altar. That is what I mean by serving the university purpose rather than a denominational one.

In this community are 10,000 persons, treated seriously by the registrar, the dean, the professor, the student government and the health department. But these same 10,000 junior persons, tossed about by every wind of doctrine, beset on every side by temptations common to us all and held rigidly self-sufficient by

a pride native to youth, are treated but half seriously by us. We are church agents, named to complement the university, to provide that one phase of life which the state, by virtue of its organic law, is restrained from providing. But it takes at least as much time, talent and energy for the average university pastor to keep his church, the institution he serves, sympathetic with his university work and get the educational point of view understood as it takes to perform his definite religious duties.

In such a situation it is impossible for us to deal with these 10,000 students or any proper fraction of them in a thorough educational way on the delicate and far-reaching subject of religion. Yet, last year the Catholics, the Jews and the Protestants, including the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A., spent nearly \$75,000 on our work. No wonder a student said recently, "I'll be darned! I could go out with that money and hire the student body to be devout."

As one who doubts the continued validity of the denomination as a means, I look upon an effort to clear the ground of much of our superfluous social paraphernalia as the *next duty* on the part of all religious leaders. Ten or fifteen per cent of our leaders in the various bodies might differ with us on that statement, but fully eighty-five per cent of them would accept that statement in the abstract. The reasons why so few of us in the churches can act upon it run deep in the structure of our professional and economic life. Those reasons are not such reasons as Jesus would validate. They are not reasons which would give us comfort as we recall Savonarola, Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Edwards, or Phillips Brooks. Denominations have served their day. But their day is past. Where Christianity thrives each unit whether a congregation or a college or a club, regardless of its name, claims all the good of every denomination and refuses to be circumscribed by the withering negatives of any one of them. We need to aim at not serving of a denominational purpose but a university purpose in religion.

II. THE STAFF

A staff chosen on the basis of function. Where then shall we introduce an improved method? At the university is my answer.

Most of us at this table are tied to pastoral routine by the gentle characteristics of Christianity. We have to humor the aged. We must formulate our teaching so that it will encourage the dull minds. We must minister to the hundreds who have fallen asleep intellectually. We must stimulate scores who are committed to ruts from which they will never be extricated. Also, by the very inertia of the average mind, pastors in their work are often confined to actual use of creeds and customs which they do not use personally. The tenderness of Jesus' spirit lives within his church. This goal is so insistent, its rewards in appreciation are so immediate, its claims so glibly stated, that pastors are preempted by this deed-of-mercy demand.

University pastors are free from that demand. Those engaged at the educational work of the church can, if they will, rise above the denomination and meet students on the direct issues of Christianity. Our work at the campus, therefore, should not be done denominationally, but through federation or some other cooperative method. We need the spirit of adventure if we expect to influence youth or have fellowship with education at its best.

Our staff should be selected on the basis of function rather than on the basis of affiliation. That is, each should have a task to perform for the *whole group* along a *given line*,—vocations, or worship or counseling or Bible teaching or social integration. Then such pastoral work or directing of worship at the Presbyterian or Episcopal place of worship will serve the particular constituency without detracting from the whole. Our counseling, our teaching, our social life, our directing of student enterprises and our educational engineering in behalf of religion should all be directed and carried forward on an educational basis. An attempted unity is the central notion. The initial demand is that the executives for Protestants cease developing programs independently. Executive leadership should be centralized. When a central executive headquarters is given power we may be able to use various rooms or buildings. But until we are unified much of our altogether worthy industry is in vain. Also, an enterprise such as a denominational student headquarters erected apart from the Y. M. C. A. on one hand, and far removed from a local place of worship on the other hand, is an educational misnomer. It is not consistent with the unifying Christian ideals

that we profess. For the Methodists and the Baptists and the Jews and the Presbyterians to line the campus on a single street and still others to run separate "centers" co-called, is to defeat Christ in the student population before we introduce Him. A centralizing of all our work under an able executive and a single board of control would change the whole aspect.

Now, we have no quarrel with the isolation of places of worship of the family units in the city or historical lines of cleavage. We concede that to be necessary. Our fathers and our grandfathers have rights and they want denominational groupings. But to try to fasten denominational divisions, however good-naturedly, on a university is an error. The ideas which great Christian leaders contributed for the welfare of all humanity will remain. To try institutionalizing our sects is only to waste our time in a futility. To some, it seems equivalent to profanity. God cannot prosper us, my brethren, in any such a mistaken proposal.

Unified Communities

We are not talking fiction. For fifty years there have been unified Protestant efforts in various student centers. A Y. M. C. A. here, a college there, a federated effort yonder has given an example. In Toronto denominational colleges and the provincial university have long been an educational unity. At the University of Pennsylvania and at Cornell in Ithaca the Associations and the university pastors have been unified for twenty-five years and altars have not suffered. At the University of Missouri various bodies cooperate in the conduct of a College of Religion. In the courses six hundred students were enrolled last year. At the University of Iowa and at our own University of California at Los Angeles the Jews, Catholics and Protestants go forward in a single corporation, with one executive, a joint budget and under one roof, while in Oregon the state university presidents have granted cooperation and are encouraging the religious bodies to develop schools of religion at Eugene and Corvallis. Hence our work at Berkeley takes low rank in comparison with many educational centers. We are in a stale mate in Berkeley. Every institution is "sitting tight." We are wasting twenty-five to seventy-five per cent of the time, money and talent we expend in such a situation. Members of the Uni-

versity faculty have a right to look upon us as unworthy of the high calling in Christ. None speak, but to the man who understands, their silence is significant and their reluctance a chastisement.

III. A DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION

Our chief duty is to complete educational opportunity. Yale spends \$70,000 a year on a department of religion. Chicago, Harvard, Northwestern, etc., have such departments. The educational opportunity in Berkeley cannot be said to be complete until such a department is created. Much of the work is now being done in departments possible to a state. For this all citizens should be grateful. The University of California is not irreligious. Our faculties strive to be non-sectarian and are perhaps as successful in being impartial in religion as in politics, or commerce or industry or education. Within the curriculum there are scores of courses such as are provided in departments of religion or in seminaries. There are vast stretches of religious experience being covered with a sympathy and a devotion unsurpassed.

If we possessed a central purpose, had a board representing our various denominations to function as the Regents function, and brought every problem for review before the best men we could jointly deliver as advisers and trustees, we would be able to capitalize all such splendid educational allies within the university. The task of creating a school of religion equal to such a department of religion as now functions at Columbia, University of Southern California or Princeton is a challenging one. To make a beginning we must first win the educational leaders of our denominations and bring about a singleness of purpose. After that, such matters as credit courses may be properly considered. Until unity is ours no educational approach to the University is even a possibility. As it is, we cannot get near the faculty. We fall short of being an educational enterprise. The University of California, though cordial, is almost as remote from us as Stanford many miles away. We are in different worlds. As a result religion is inadequately represented at the educational capital of these western states. To change this situation, bring order out of chaos and frankly face the task of completing educational opportunity is a major not a minor task.

Local Experience

In our effort at promotion of the campus classes in religion we discover: (1) That there is a great gulf fixed between university and organized religion. (2) That there is no wholesome working agreement between the churches and the Christian Associations. (3) That the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. are dissimilar in purpose and program and have some difficulties in adjustment. (4) That the faculty men are our best friends. They appreciate the united methods, know the genuine value of the data and see the possibilities in an intellectual pursuit of truth in religion.

To begin by claiming credit of academic type before anything can be attempted is to deceive ourselves. We may never be able to demonstrate an academic quality of teaching until our students have credit. We may fail to enroll numbers enough to make any sort of a case. The goal may be far removed but until we are so unified that religion (used in the sense of a field of knowledge) can knock at the door of the university and say, "We come as a unit," we will continue to stand in the way of our own progress. When we Protestants have agreement and then can hit upon some working arrangement with Catholics and Jews, we may confidently expect that the university authorities will hear our petitions. Once united, our cause will again take on the nature of a serious consideration. The university administrators are not unaware of certain moral, spiritual and educational responsibilities which at present baffle the deans. Some of these matters now fall between them and us. To hold the deans to a responsibility while we continue a state of social impotency among ourselves is to cast discredit on our own morals.

A Reversal Necessary

Also, this disease of undue Protestant freedom will not be cured by a poultice applied on the outside of any community. The case will require a major surgical operation peculiar to the locality. We pastors may suffer professionally before the cure is effected. Our denominations may be called upon to curtail programs, halt buildings and rearrange plans. Our Christian Associations, as well as some of our churches may have to sift their motives. Some of the positions taken by various univer-

sity deans and organizations and even courts will have to come back for review. Years ago when given incidents threw one question into the limelight to the exclusion of others, education in religion was belittled. Previous questions long closed must be reopened and studied impersonally. To education itself a united approach is the only approach.

We university pastors may find it necessary to face our church boards with a different sort of program from that we converted them to in the beginning. For one, I am willing to pay that price if my work is in that case. The ecclesiastical geography of the average university city in America is confusing the students and damaging to the welfare of Christianity. There now stand in Madison, Wisconsin, a beautiful university city, two Lutheran edifices, both fronting on the campus. Both were built partly by missionary money. Both exist to serve students. The only case to compete with it is that of Berkeley, where there are two edifices erected by the two branches of my own church. Both are for students and both use missionary funds. Is not this "altar against altar?" Brethren, this is a grievous social miscarriage. This brings us to the question of central importance. Just now, when streets are being closed to make way for university expansion, when an International House is being opened through the generosity of a great Christian donor, when the Y. M. C. A. must move from its historic site and the Y. W. C. A. looks forward to a like situation in a few years, when but one denomination has a new building on Bancroft Way, while our three theological seminaries, patronized by six denominations, are still young and their futures yet to be determined,—I appeal to you to join in a movement to create at the Golden Gate a united religious enterprise for the students at the University of California. I appeal to you to give the weight of your positions in a study which will encourage our several boards on campus Christian work to record themselves. I appeal to you to join in an interpretation of the situation in the light of the Kingdom of God. If we do this we may confidently hope that each separate *ecclesiastical unit* will be caught up in a sacred enthusiasm and given a significance which will carry each church far beyond its own humble starting place. No less is Christian.

STUDENT WORK AND PROBLEMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

REVEREND CLIFFORD M. DRURY, Pastor of Moscow
Presbyterian Church

Since CHRISTIAN EDUCATION has given me assistance in my work, perhaps a little experience gained here will be of value to others.

A little more than a year ago I came to this small university city of Moscow. The state university is here with some two thousand students. I found that it took me nearly a year to get acquainted. Since the church had been without a pastor for eight months, the work with the university young people was not as effective as it once was. My task is twofold here—I am pastor of a Presbyterian church of about 350 members and also the student pastor of about an equal number of students.

A study of the situation has revealed the following facts. About 85 per cent of the students at this university register some church membership or preference. In that respect the university runs true to the average for the country. Since there is no Congregational church in the city we try to look after the Congregational students. Last year they numbered about eighty, the balance were Presbyterians. Naturally the Congregational students do not feel the same degree of loyalty to us as they would to a church of their own denomination.

All of the Protestant churches of the city are about a mile from the university. The Mormons completed a beautiful \$75,000.00 institute at the very edge of the campus last year. They have about seventy students in the university. In the institute they give courses which are accepted, up to eight units, to apply on the B.A. degree. Such a privilege would be given by the university authorities to any other religious body provided it had the required equipment and well trained professors.

No one church has a large enough student body here to justify the erection of a separate denominational building near the campus or to secure the full time services of a student pastor. If anything is done along this line, it must be done on an inter-denominational basis. Some interest in such a project has been

awakened and we hope something can be started in the way of an interdenominational school of religious education.

This year I felt that special effort should be made to reach the fraternity and sorority young people. We have twelve fraternities and eight sororities. It has been pointed out that our young people's meetings in the evening do not draw the young people from these houses. The program each Sunday evening calls for a social hour at five o'clock at which refreshments are served. This is followed by the Christian Endeavor meeting. Our average attendance this year at this two-hour gathering has been around forty. One evening I noticed that but four out of the forty belonged to a sorority or a fraternity, and two of these four were town girls who lived at home.

In reviewing the information given to us by the registrar of the university, we learned that we had some—not less than three and in one case as high as nineteen, men or women in each fraternity or sorority who had indicated preference for our church. We also learned that more than 50 per cent of our 350 names were the names of the fraternity or sorority young people.

As far as church attendance is concerned, I feel that we are getting as many of the young people from the houses as we are from the dormitories or homes. We rarely have less than sixty students present at the morning service and have had as many as 125 several times. Very few attend the evening service.

Feeling the need of knowing how these fine boys and girls from the fraternities and sororities felt about the church's program, I arranged a dinner to which I invited a representative from each house together with the house mother in case there was one. I made an effort to visit each house and to choose some person who had come to church with some regularity last year to be the representative at the dinner. Eight of the twelve fraternities were represented. In the discussion which followed I outlined the church's program and asked why it was we were not reaching the group they represented in certain phases of our work. Among the answers given were these: "The social program of the young people at the church cannot compete with the social program of the sororities and fra-

ternities." "Some of the houses have their firesides Sunday evening." (Though in reality it was shown that there was no actual conflict except in one or two cases. Those who attended the Christian Endeavor meeting could get back in time.) "Sunday evening is the time when we are out with our boy or girl friends."

Upon inquiry it was learned that only half of the houses represented had attended some church in town in a body during the past year. All said that it was their custom to go in a body at least once a year. One sorority required all pledges to attend the church of their choice at least once each Sunday. I had the opportunity of suggesting to them that they go back to their respective houses and see to it that their group attend some church in a body during the coming year. This they gladly promised to do.

I am sure that the meeting has stimulated church attendance. Each representative was given the list of those in his or her house who had expressed preference for our church and was told to pass on a personal invitation to those whose names were on the list to attend church. I feel that it would be profitable to call this group together again next spring to check up on what has been done.

Out of that group gathering came several valuable suggestions. It has been my custom here to send out a notice to all students before our communion services. We hold these services on the first Sunday of alternate months beginning with October. The increased attendance of students on communion Sundays shows that the notices do help to bring them out to church. As a church we are now using communion cards, sending them to our members and friends. I am going to try sending them to the students as well, asking them to deposit the cards in the collection plates. One suggestion which grew out of the above mentioned meeting was that the representative in each fraternity or sorority house distribute these cards personally rather than have them mailed. We plan to adopt this plan before our next communion Sunday. Representatives have also been selected in the different dormitories to do likewise.

Through the university chapter of the Westminster Guild we are making a very definite effort to reach the sorority girls. All of the officers are sorority members and the meetings are to be held in the various houses with an occasional meeting in the girls' dormitories.

Some of our very finest young people are in the fraternities and sororities. I fear that too often the church workers have assumed that the attitude or the program in these houses is hostile to the church and that therefore not much is to be expected from a religious viewpoint from the young people who have entered them. Perhaps the social side of our young people's program will not appeal to them. Perhaps the firesides do conflict with the evening program of the Christian Endeavor. If so, then emphasis must be laid on those other features of church work which will appeal and in which there is no conflict, such as attendance at Sunday school and church, and such monthly activities as the Westminster Guild.

Dr. Oscar M. Voorhees, Secretary of Phi Beta Kappa and Dr. Robert L. Kelly were speakers on the Founders' Day program at Alfred University, Thursday, December 5. Dr. Kelly also held a conference with the Alfred Faculty after the special exercises were over.

Dr. Wendell S. Brooks, head of the Department of Education at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill., has been unanimously elected president of Intermountain Union College.

Dr. Harry S. Ganders, Professor of Education in the University of Cincinnati, has accepted the deanship of Teachers College of Syracuse University.

Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga., has just let a contract for a new administration and class room building, to cost about \$315,000, and to be ready for use in September, 1930. It will be named Buttrick Hall in honor of the first President of the General Education Board of New York, who took special interest in Agnes Scott. The Board has helped the College four times and contributed the money for the buildings now being erected.

THE THEOLOGICAL WORLD

GARDINER M. DAY

THE CROWDED SEMINARIES

In these days when so much is heard and read about religious decline it is heartening to read in many reports from our theological schools of the largest entering classes on record. The General Theological School, the Episcopal Theological School in Virginia, the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, and the Union Theological Seminary are good examples. The Union *Alumni Bulletin* says:

The number of new students exceeds all records. For the first time at the beginning of any year the dormitory is full and there is a waiting list. . . . The wide geographical distribution of students is even more noteworthy than the large numbers. A group of seven entered from one New England college. The largest numbers come from the Middle West—Ohio to Oklahoma and Colorado. There are unusually large numbers also from Philadelphia, Baltimore and the South.

The report then continues to note the large number of foreign students, from Europe, the Orient and the Near East.

UNION'S FIRST SUMMER SESSION

The interest in summer work proves to be so vitally interesting to such a large number of active ministers that we print the following paragraph from the aforesaid *Bulletin*:

It is with real satisfaction that we can look back upon the Seminary's first summer session. For some years many of our friends had urged us to offer a summer course for credit, but it seemed a large undertaking and one the need of which was by no means clear. However, we decided to try the experiment last summer and took advantage of Columbia University's kind offer to hold our school in cooperation with the Columbia school, which each session enrolls thousands. While preserving our independence in the matter of the development of the curriculum and the appointment of teachers, we were greatly helped by the use of Columbia's facilities for registration and by the constant advice and assistance of the Director of her Summer Session, whose cooperation, generously given, was invaluable. . . . The re-

sults far exceeded our expectations and clearly demonstrated that there were many students eager for what the Seminary could offer in such a summer course. Therefore it is that already we are making plans for the summer session of 1930.

The session last summer was six weeks in length and was attended by 161 students, who, representing thirty-two states and seven foreign countries, as well as some eighteen denominations. Among them were seventy-two ministers, thirteen professors, twenty-one school teachers, six students of Hebrew affiliation, including several Jewish rabbis, and one Roman Catholic student.

NEW YEAR CONFERENCE ON THE MINISTRY

Dr. Drury of St. Paul's School, in cooperation with the Department of Religious Education of the Episcopal Church, is laying plans for a New Year's conference on the ministry to be held at the school in Concord, New Hampshire, the week-end of January 3-6, 1920. The conference will be limited to a select group of men and will be sufficiently small so that the most vital problems can be discussed to advantage. The leaders of the conference will include Dr. Wilfred Grenfell of Laborador and the Rev. A. Herbert Gray of England. In reply to an invitation to be one of the leaders at the conference Dr. Grenfell wrote: "I tell you candidly there is nothing I would rather do. I do not believe that there is anything so much needed as the awakening of the young ministers to the glory of the crusade that lies ahead of them." If anyone is interested in knowing more about the conference he should write to the Rev. C. Leslie Glenn, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

GALE SEAMAN BEGINS HIS WORK

The first meeting of the Theological Sub-Committee since the acceptance by Gale Seaman of the post of Y. M. C. A. Secretary for the Theological Seminaries was called by the chairman, Dr. George Stewart, and held in New York City on October 28.

Mr. Seaman reported very favorably upon his reception in twelve seminaries he visited while on his way from the Pacific

Coast. He said that in each case the students were interested to learn what was being done in other seminaries and what could be done to draw seminaries into closer understanding and fellowship. It was decided that the most important objectives of the work are to bring about:

1. Greater interseminary fellowship, understanding and cooperation.
2. Increased missionary interest and commitment to Christian work.
3. More definite recruiting for full term Christian workers by such means as deputations from seminary to college.
4. Where possible, more cooperation in community or public service.
5. A deeper sense of unity, opportunity and responsibility with the undergraduate Student Y. M. C. A.
6. More understanding of and cooperation with the World's Student Christian Federation.
7. The promotion of interseminary conferences, both regional and possibly national.
8. And last, although by no means least, anything that would help to enrich the personal religious life of the students.

It was the distinct belief of the Committee that every effort should be made to make any interseminary conference that might be held of such high caliber that attendance would be well worth while on the part of the students. To this end it was suggested that the thought of the entire conference be concentrated upon one topic and the best possible leaders be secured. A most helpful conference of this sort was held at the Crozier Theological School last year upon "The Reality of Worship." The particular subjects which seem to the Committee to lend themselves to such conferences are:

1. The general field of the devotional life; prayer, worship, etc.
2. The general field of human relations; psychology and religion, psychiatry, confession, etc., and
3. The church's relation to secular agencies; charity organizations, peace organizations, movements toward church unity, etc.

The Committee voted to cooperate with Dr. Drury and Mr. Glenn in the conference reported above, etc. Mr. Bennett reported upon his conversations with the British Student Movement. An account of these conversations will appear in a later issue of the *Intercollegian*. The members of the Theological Committee present were: Dr. George Stewart, Chairman; John Bennett, William Matthias, Morgan P. Noyes, David R. Porter, Robert Russell, Gale Seaman, H. P. Van Dusen and the writer.

We are happy to mention, in closing, the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Presbyterian Theological School of Chicago which took place on October 29th. The seminary started upon its second century by inaugurating as President Dr. John Timothy Stone. May Dr. Stone lead the Seminary to increasingly greater work and influence.

THE CHILD'S BILL OF RIGHTS, CHRISTMAS, 1929

I MIGHT REPEAT THAT A BILL OF RIGHTS SHOULD BE WRITTEN FOR CHILDREN; I WOULD COMPOSE IT SOMEWHAT AS FOLLOWS:

The ideal to which we should strive is that there shall be no child in America that has not been born under proper conditions, that does not live in hygienic surroundings, that ever suffers from under-nutrition, that does not have prompt and efficient medical attention and inspection, that does not receive primary instruction in the element of hygiene and good health; that there shall be no child that has not the complete birthright of a sound mind in a sound body and the encouragement to express in fullest measure the spirit within which is the final endowment of every human being.—HERBERT HOOVER.

The Morgan College five-year campaign for funds for the erection of a men's dormitory, a new science hall, additional improved equipment and the payment of indebtedness has been brought to a successful issue. The new dormitory was opened on November 22.

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL
INSTRUCTORS, EDITED BY ISMAR J. PERITZ, PROFESSOR OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

*Editorial***ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS**

The annual meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors will be held in the Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York City, on Tuesday evening, December 31, and Wednesday morning, January 1, 1930.

Professor William H. Wood, of Dartmouth College, the Chairman of the Program Committee, announces that the meeting will begin with a dinner at the Seminary Refectory at six o'clock. The evening session will begin at 7:30 o'clock.

Among the speakers announced are the Rev. Charles T. Bridgman, Canon of St. George's Cathedral, Jerusalem, who will speak on "Present Religious Conditions in Palestine;" Professor Wilbur M. Urban, Professor of Philosophy at Dartmouth College and author of *The Intelligible World* that appeared recently; Bernard I. Bell, The Warden, Saint Stephen's College, on the subject "Character Building in College Education." It is expected that a goodly number of short papers will be read by members as is done in other societies. Among the subjects to be discussed is "The Biblical Material for Character Training." Time will be allowed for a real exchange of experiences—some have asked for this. It is also hoped that there will be a fruitful discussion of the future of our Association. Can we not find some corporate soul that will unite and give us more of an impact on our times?

It has been the custom for many years to hold the meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors immediately following that of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis because many of the members are interested and hold membership in both. The Association was aware of the fact that adherence to the custom would this year involve the holding of the

meeting on New Year's Eve and New Year's Day. The discussion indicated that that was not a serious objection. The better the day, the better the deed. To start the New Year with a consideration of our problems is very appropriate; and no mere social engagement deserves to be considered a worthy rival. It is hoped, therefore, that the attendance will be generous.

The Editorial Secretary of the Association is greatly dependent upon the annual meeting for material; and he would urgently request our members to make use of the invitation to furnish papers for discussion and publication.—I. J. P.

THE PSALTER AND MODERN LIFE

PROFESSOR HARRIS B. STEWART, Auburn Theological Seminary

The Psalter is an intensely human book. It runs the whole gamut of human experience. In it we find man exalted to spiritual heights and plunged in the depths of dark despair. It voices the noblest of human longings and aspirations and it gives utterance to the most terrible of imprecations. Here we find hot indignation against one's enemies and the calmer peace of him who puts his trust in God. It is the very soul of the Hebrew nation pouring itself out in praise and thanksgiving, in prayer and supplication. What an insight we get into the life and thought of the nation whose hymns these were! With what fervor must these hymns have been sung! For they are hymns, and we have in the Psalter the hymn book of the Second Temple. The extent to which the book was actually used by the choir and the worshipers it might be difficult to determine. But whatever its function in the temple worship, it came to have, and still has, a large place in the worship of the Christian church. We are not now concerned as to the process by which this Hebrew hymn book was taken over by Christian church, but we are interested in the question as to whether or not it is a suitable medium for expressing the experience of the twentieth century, for voicing our aspirations and our supplications.

Hymn books very quickly get out of date. And yet here is the Psalter unchanged for nearly 2,500 years and still in use. Is its

antiquity the only reason for its continuance in our public worship or does it still speak to the heart and from the heart as it did of old?

We might as well face the facts and admit at the outset that there are in the Psalms things that are out of keeping with our present ideas. We think at once of the imprecatory psalms expressive of the most vengeful and bitter feelings, calling down upon one's enemies the most terrible of curses. Who of us can read the 109th psalm without a shudder. The psalmist prays that God may treat thus one who has wronged him:

Set over him one that is godless,
An opponent at his right hand.
From his trial let him come forth guilty,
May his prayer be counted as sin.
Grant that his days may be few,
That his office be seized by another.
Grant that has children be fatherless,
And that his wife be a widow.

(McFayden: *The Psalms in Modern Speech*)

Nothing could be further from a Christian conception of our attitude toward our enemies.

But that which offends us most in these psalms is not the malediction as much as the character of a god to whom a worshiper can bring such a cry for vengeance. It has nothing in common with the God revealed in Jesus. He who taught men to say forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors has made it impossible for any disciple of his to come to his God with such a petition on his lips or such thoughts in his heart. Certainly we have outgrown the imprecatory psalms and any revision of this hymn book for the twentieth century would leave them out.

Another point at which we today cannot be satisfied with the outlook of the psalmist is the dark and hopeless mystery with which the dead were enshrouded. For him conscious personality ceased when the breath left the body. There might be some shadowy form of existence amid the gloom of Sheol but it was vague and indefinite and meaningless. It is true that there are one or two passages that look as though there was the expectation of sharing the joys to be found in the presence of God, but it may be they have some other interpretation or explanation. The

general viewpoint is to be found in such statements as these: "In death there is no remembrance of thee. In Sheol who shall give thee thanks;" "The dead praise not Jehovah, neither any that go down into silence."

Canst thou work wonders for the dead?

Can ghosts arise to praise thee?

Can thy love be recounted in the grave,

Thy faithfulness within the world below?

Can thy wonders be known in the darkness,

Thy saving help in the land of oblivion?

(Moffatt: *A New Translation*)

Such hymns must have made melancholy singing and when compared with the hymns in our books under the heading "Life Everlasting" but show how far we have come in the light that shines from the empty tomb of Jesus. Certainly no one can be a believer in Jesus and hold the view of the psalmist with regard to death.

As one reads the psalms carefully he is impressed with the national character of these hymns. Their religion was a national religion, their hopes for the future were all bound up with the nation. This feeling seems to have been deepened by the exile. And so, naturally, their hymns express this national viewpoint, and in so far are hardly suited for Christian worship. Some psalms find their truest interpretation when viewed as purely national, others are just as surely personal, and many might be either according to our theological or critical bias. But even those that are national may not be without value for us. At any rate you and I in our private devotions and in our public worship do use this ancient hymn book. It is not out of date nor to be discarded because, despite the gulf that separates twentieth century America from the Jewry of the fifth century before Christ, it still voices the fundamental needs and longings of the human heart.

Human nature has not changed much with the passing of the centuries and man's deepest emotions today are not unlike those of his fellows in the past. Joy still fills his heart and life. It is a beautiful world in which he lives, brightened by the sunshine of God's smile, enriched with delightful associations and relationships, full of unexpected mercies. Is this our experience and do

we long to give utterance to the deep joy within us? So did the psalmist and his book is full of hymns that fairly bubble over with sheer happiness. His happiness was not the result of his own unaided effort and he praises God for all the good things of life.

Let the people praise thee, O God;
 Let all the peoples praise thee.
 The earth hath yielded its increase;
 God, even our own God, will bless us.

Or those familiar words of the one hundredth psalm:

Make a joyful noise unto Jehovah, all ye lands.
 Serve Jehovah with gladness;
 Come before his presence with singing.

The book is just as abundant in hymns that are expressive of the dark and trying experiences of life. And here too it touches the deep realities of our common living. Perhaps the lot of the Jew was always a hard one. For generations there has been a Pale, social or economic, out of which he might not and could not venture. The history of the nation and the life of the individual furnished ample opportunity for songs of distress and many a time have their woes been ours and their *de profundis* has been on our lips as out of the depths we have cried unto the Lord. The most bitter cry that was ever wrung from the depths of a human heart was an echo from the Psalms—"My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And lesser men in less keen anguish of body and spirit like him have turned to the Psalms.

Save me, O God,
 for the waters are threatening my life;
 I am sinking deep in the mud,
 where foothold there is none.
 I have fallen into waters deep,
 floods o'er me sweep.
 I am wearied with crying,
 my throat is parched,
 Mine eyes are weak
 with waiting for my God.

(Moffatt: *A New Translation*)

But what of our inability to understand so much that happens to us and to others—the inequalities of life, the prosperity of the wicked, the afflictions of the righteous, and above all the appar-

ent indifference of God to the injustice and cruelty of men, to the failure of good causes, to the overwhelming of good men. Could we better voice our indignation and surprise than in the words of the seventy-third psalm:

I nearly lost my footing
 in anger at the godless and their arrogance,
 at the sight of their success.
 No pain is theirs,
 but sound, strong health;
 No part have they in human cares,
 no blows like other men.
 So they vaunt them in their pride,
 and flaunt them in rough insolence;

 So people turn to follow them,
 and see no wrong in them,
 Thinking, "What does God care?
 How can the Almighty heed—when these,
 The godless, prosperously fare,
 thriving thus at their ease?"

(Moffatt: *A New Translation*)

Every one of us, however, when we search our own hearts is ready to confess that at least a portion of his misfortune is due to his own folly and sin. There may not be the same consciousness of sin that our fathers had. There is certainly less emphasis upon it than formerly. This has not been without some gain. It is interesting to note that the psalms are in accord with our modern attitude in this matter. There is no undue dwelling upon open faults or secret sins but there is frank and honest confession and a desire for forgiveness. It was from no general sense of sin but with a very definite piece of wrong doing in mind that the psalmist wrote that plea for pardon which you and I in deep contrition and utter sincerity find well suited to our frequent need.

In thy kindness, O God, be gracious to me,
 In thine own great pity blot out my transgressions.
 Wash me clean of my guilt,
 Make me pure of my sin.
 Purge thou me with hyssop,
 Wash me whiter than snow.

Fill me with joy and gladness,
Let the bones thou hast broken rejoice.

(McFayden: *The Psalms in Modern Speech*)

Still another element in our common humanity that the Psalms express is the deep longing of the soul for God. As we look around us today we are not so sure that man displays any eager yearning for fellowship with the Father of his spirit. But I have an idea that much on the surface of things that appears to be irreligious and godless is in reality the reaching out of the hearts of men, groping blindly in the darkness, for that which they cannot describe or define, but which is nothing else than the cry of the soul for God. We may use a different figure of speech and different languages but it is the same longing.

As the hart panteth after the water brooks,
So panteth my soul after thee, O God,
My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God.
O God, thou art my God; earnestly will I seek thee,
My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee,
In a dry and weary land, where no water is.

What is this God like to whom the psalmist turns with such eagerness? Is he a God to whom we can give ourselves? It is not to be denied that in many of the psalms feelings and motives and actions are ascribed to him that to us are incompatible with the Divine Being. But in general the God who is revealed in the Psalms is the kind of a God whom you and I could love and obey and trust.

He is first of all righteous. From all the welter of sensual idolatry with which they were surrounded Israel's God rose pure and holy. This was, of course, the result of slow development for which the prophets were in large measure responsible. But it is of the very genius of the Hebrew religion that God is good. It is the age-long demand of the human heart that He whom we worship must be the embodiment of that holiness for which we so vainly strive. No other but a good God will satisfy us. In this we are in complete harmony with the Psalms and these hymns may well be ours.

For Jehovah is righteous; he loveth righteousness; the upright shall behold his face.

Jehovah reigneth; let the earth rejoice;

Let the multitude of isles be glad.
Clouds and darkness are round about him:
Righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne.

Having assured ourselves that he is righteous, we insist also that he be a loving God. This is the veriest commonplace of our religious thinking. One would think that here if anywhere the Psalms would be of little use to us. And yet we find that precisely the opposite is the case. The great majority of the one hundred and fifty songs that make up this hymn book are concerned in one form or another with the exposition of the theme, God is love. Much of the teaching of Jesus is based directly on the Psalms. It is enough to mention his beautiful allegory of the Good Shepherd whose roots almost certainly must have been in the twenty-third psalm, that most beautiful expression of the loving and tender care of a gracious God. It is almost the first part of the Bible which our children commit to memory and it abides with us to the end a source of constant joy and comfort.

Once your attention has been called to it, many psalms setting forth God's love will readily occur to you. The words of the one hundred and third psalm are familiar to all of us. Dr. Moffatt has changed the familiar phrases but he has added new beauty.

The Eternal is pitiful and gracious,
slow to be angry, rich in love;
He will not always chafe,
he will not hold to his anger for all time;
He treats us not according to our sins,
he deals not with us as our guilt deserves;
But, high as heaven is over earth,
so vast his love is to his worshipers;
Far as the east is from the west,
so far he puts our sins away from us.
As a father pities his children,
so the Eternal pities his worshipers;
He knows what we are made of,
he remembers we are dust.

(Moffatt: *A New Translation*)

But what of the activity of God. How do the Psalms represent him as related to the physical world, a physical world of which the psalmist knew comparatively little when one thinks of all that science has discovered since his time? For him it was all very simple. God created the world and acts as its constant

upholder and governor, by him everything that happens in it is determined. Our science may be very different from that of the psalmist, but like him we hold that God made the world, that He is active in it and that He is still the Master of his universe. We may talk of evolution and the reign of law, these are but the ways in which He works and are in no sense substitutes for His operations. The psalmist, however, does not discuss the manner of God's working, though he undoubtedly thought of it as being direct, and so we can take for our own his hymns extolling Jehovah as Creator and Governor.

Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment;
Who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain.
Who laid the foundations of the earth,
That it should not be moved forever.

There are many other things in the Psalms of which I would like to speak, did time permit, that fit into our modern life and thought with surprising accuracy. There are ethical values that are constantly appearing. Read, for example, in Dr. Moffatt's translation the description of a good man as given in psalm fifteen and note the emphasis laid upon the social virtues. Or see in more than one psalm the preference of the psalmist for right conduct as compared with formal worship and sacrifice as a means of obtaining the divine favor. The eighth psalm speaks of man's insignificance as compared with the immensity of the universe, though of the real extent of that immensity the psalmist never dreamed. But over against that insignificance he sets, as do we, the fact that man stands at the head of creation—"Thou has made him but little lower than God." There is a distinctly modern flavor to the description in the ninety-fourth psalm of the complete indifference on the part of the godless and their feeling that God is not a factor that needs to be reckoned with.

We have not outgrown the Psalms. I doubt if we ever will, though there is much in them that seems strange. They bring to us the reaching out of man to God, the upward striving of the heart which is common to us all. Not until men cease to be stirred by genuine religious feeling will these psalms lose their appeal to the human heart. Not until men no longer need God will they fail to voice man's cry for the Eternal.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A LIVING TRUST AND AN ANNUITY AGREEMENT

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY

The difference between a living trust and an annuity agreement is wide at the extremes and almost disappears at a central point of comparison.

To be concrete: A man may give to ——— College \$10,000 as a living trust, meaning thereby to have the college, as trustee, take title, invest and administer the \$10,000 and pay him the net income thereof so long as he lives. The document which sets forth the conditions of such a transaction would be called a "living trust" or a trust agreement.

Another man may give to ——— College \$10,000, with the agreement that so long as he lives the college shall pay him in annual, or semi-annual, or quarterly, instalments as the case may be, \$600 a year. In this case the document which sets forth the particulars of the transaction will be called "an annuity agreement," and the money paid to the donor will be "an annuity" and he then will become "an annuitant."

In the former instance, if the money in the living trust earns \$600 net a year, and \$600 is paid to the man who created the trust by the trustor, then the two transactions in their effects are the same, and the two men giving the same amount of money receive the same income through life, while the college has the same sum of money and handles it with the same, or a similar, freedom and responsibility. In each case the giver of the money may prescribe and may embody his intentions in the document drawn, as to how the fund shall be used after his death,—as a permanent fund to be held in trust, creating a memorial for him or for some other person, the income of which only shall be expended, and for certain purposes which he may choose to prescribe, or he may, in both cases, permit the principal sum to be expended through the current budget of the college, in one year or through a period of years. His wishes in these respects, varied as he may choose, may be specified and will be executed, as stated.

The man with the \$10,000 in either case may turn to some other agency to serve as trustee, either under the living trust or in the creation of the annuity. As a living trust, he may make a trust company or a bank with fiduciary powers, or an individual, the trustee. As an annuity agreement, he may make a trust company or a bank with fiduciary powers, or a life insurance company, trustee, to invest and administer the funds as an annuity, diminishing the principal, year by year, if it fail to earn the guaranteed annuity of \$600.

An essential difference occurs in reference to the sum of money which shall be paid to the man. Under the living trust he will receive the net income of the \$10,000 when invested, whether that net income amounts to \$400 or \$800. Under the annuity agreement, he has guaranteed to him a \$600 annual payment, no more and no less, whatever his \$10,000 may earn. If it earns more than \$600 a year, the college receives the benefit of the surplus; if it earns less than \$600 a year, the college must make good out of the principle, the deficit. (The college should not replace deficits arising in such a fund as this out of moneys given by other people.)

If we go further, differences at once appear. Moneys paid in on annuity agreements cannot be withdrawn; once paid, they are parted with forever. But moneys paid in under a living trust may be withdrawn, if the trust be revocable, and any living trust may be made revocable, if the trustor so stipulates at the outset. The living trust, therefore, affords the giver of the money an opportunity to reconsider the whole transaction if, with the passage of time, there be reasons for so doing. (Provided in the trust agreement he has distinctly stated that it is revocable. In case no such provision is stated the trust, in law, is regarded as irrevocable.)

In either document other persons may be named as joint participants in the annual income, but under the living trust greater flexibility is allowed and the various objects may be benefited in stated proportions, while the trustor is living, or after his death as he may determine and distinctly state in the trust document.

As for their legal character, and implications of a legal nature, I suppose a layman (as distinguished from a lawyer) might make these comments: The annuity agreement belongs ordinarily in the general field of life insurance, since its continuance and usually the rate of annual payments are determined by life expectancy and are reckoned in view of what are called "actuarial estimates," calculations derived from the assembling of human experience in the terms of the expected continuance of life at various ages. Laws, therefore, of the Federal Government and of the different states may, and already do bring some of these annuity agreement transactions under the insurance laws, and there is a tendency to bring this kind of business more and more into the office of the commissioner of insurance of the different states and have it regulated as the life insurance business is regulated.

Trust agreements, on the other hand, belong in the field of contracts, in which, during the years past, a greater body of experience and of precedents has been accumulated. The law of contracts goes back much further than laws relating to life insurance. Contracts concern almost every kind of business and nearly every feature of life. As a contract, therefore, a trust agreement, whether to take effect during a man's life, or after his death, if distinctly stated and agreed to by the two or more parties concerned, becomes then inviolable, with fewer contingencies as to new and unforeseen legislation on the part of the forty-nine different bodies in our country which are enacting more or less new legislation every year. A layman, such as is the writer, would say, then, that the trust agreement is more firmly established and less liable to uncertainties from the point of view of law and legislation, than is the annuity agreement.

Living trusts have the following clear advantages:

1. The possibility of litigation is reduced to a minimum. There can be no contest over the meaning of phrases as in a will or annuity agreement, which takes effect at death. Both parties to the agreement are at hand for interpretation and declaration of the meaning. Experience of the past, reaching indefinitely backward, confirms confidence in the validity of trusts, which are contracts, for the future.

2. It is an economical method of distributing property. It enables the trustor to continue to receive his income or not, as he may choose, without at the same time making a beneficiary a loser, if the trustor continue to enjoy life many years. (If it be made irrevocable, it may not be subject to inheritance taxes.)

3. A living trust permits a man to put the execution of his own will into practice. He can try the persons and the organizations which he wishes to benefit by allowing them to have the benefits while he is still living and is able to advise them, or in some cases train them, in the use of property, and then may modify his plans, altering them as experience proceeds, if he so wishes, in case he has made his trust revocable.

A fair judgment would probably regard the living trust as equitable and just to both parties. To the trustor, who is, in effect, an annuitant, it yields the entire income. To the ultimate beneficiary it yields the entire principal. The income becomes a fair and equitable annuity. Under a living trust there is no speculation, nothing which can be called "gambling" on the length of life of a beneficiary.

Some persons and organizations which have entered into annuity agreements have been astonished to discover how the annuity agreement, giving to the annuitant a sense of security with an enlarged income, tends to *prolong the life of the annuitant!*

The following comparison between the two forms may be made, respecting readiness of getting them into operation. Because of publicity given to annuity agreements by many denominational and educational boards, the public generally is better informed about annuities than it is about living trusts, and consequently, people are more ready to give funds under the annuity agreement. The ease of "selling," therefore, is greater under these conditions for the annuity agreement.

Another advantage which the annuity agreement has, is its appeal to many people who need, or desire, to increase their incomes; for the annuity agreement can promise an annual payment which is greater than the living trust can pay,—greater than the fund itself can normally earn by investment.

On the other hand, the living trust has these advantages in the field of "selling." It has a stronger appeal from the charitable side. The final gift is assured in full dimensions of 100 per cent. This is pure charity, so far as principal is concerned. In this respect the annuity agreement is partially, and sometimes quite largely, looked upon as an *investment* (not a charitable gift) because of its enhanced yield, and as the investment motive becomes prominent the charitable motive becomes less appealing. It may be that the charitable motive in some instances disappears entirely under the annuity agreement.

The flexibility of the living trust may meet the necessities of a giver better than the final and inflexible form of the annuity agreement which, when once entered upon, is unchangeable. The enhanced income from the annuity agreement may better meet the necessities of a giver. Each has its advantages; each has its place.

THE WORKER'S BOOKSHELF

Trends in Protestant Giving, Charles H. Fahs, Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1929, pp. 67. \$75.

A study of church finance based upon the examination of statistics available in church almanacs and yearbooks and in the treasurers' reports of the benevolent boards of the various Protestant denominations. If one has the patience to plow through the bewildering combinations and permutations of the statistics assembled by Dr. Fahs, he may come forth with some notion of the "broad trends" of Protestant giving which is found to have "steadily and greatly advanced during the period of fifteen years ending in 1927." The absence of uniformity in the record keeping of the different denominations makes the researcher's task an extremely difficult one, both for interpretation and for presentation.—A. M. P.

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION AND EDUCATION

Education and Religion. Charles Franklin Thwing. Macmillan Co. 265 pp. \$2.00 (1929).

What Is Christian Education? George A. Coe. Scribners. 300 pp. \$2.50 (1929).

Survey of Higher Education for the United Lutheran Church In America. R. J. Leonard, E. S. Evenden, F. B. O'Rear and others. 3 vols. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1624 pp. \$5.00 (cloth); \$3.00 (paper).

College Organization and Administration. Floyd W. Reeves and John Dale Russell, Board of Education, Disciples of Christ. 324 pp. \$2.50.

*Educational Survey of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.** B. Warren Brown and W. O. Thompson. Department of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U. S.

The Campus. Robert Cooley Angell. D. Appleton & Co. 239 pp. \$2.50 (1928).

Undergraduates. R. H. Edwards, J. M. Artwan, Galen M. Fisher. Doubleday, Doran & Co. 369 pp. \$4.00 (1928).

Denominational Policies In the Support and Supervision of Higher Education. Paul Moyer Limbert, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. 242 pp. \$2.25 (1929).

Outfitting the Teacher of Religion. James H. Snowden. Macmillan Co. 270 pp. \$2.00 (1929).

The Effective Christian College. Laird T. Hites. Macmillan Co. 257 pp. \$2.00 (1929).

Every College Student's Problems. Oscar Helmuth Werner. Silver, Burdett & Company. 370 pp. (1929).

Survey of Higher Education for the United Lutheran Church. Howard LeSourd. 136 pp. \$1.50.

**A Report on a Survey of the Theological Seminaries and the Assembly's Training School of the Presbyterian Church in the United States* (July, 1928). W. O. Thompson. 23 pp.

Report of the Survey of the Educational Work and Responsibility of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (August, 1928). B. Warren Brown. 88 pp. \$0.50.

HOW WE TEACH

by

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

and

President A. Lawrence Lowell, Harvard University
Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University
Doctor Andrew F. West, The Graduate School, Princeton University
Dean Melvin E. Haggerty, College of Education, University of Minnesota
President Arthur E. Morgan, Antioch College
President Norman F. Coleman, Reed College
Dean George E. Carrothers, Rollins College
Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College
Dean Joseph Herschel Coffin, Whittier College
Professor Edgar E. Robinson, Stanford University
Librarian William W. Bishop, University of Michigan
Professor V. A. C. Henmon, University of Wisconsin

Price, 35 cents postpaid to members of the Association of American Colleges; 85 cents postpaid to all others. The Association of American Colleges BULLETIN, Vol. XIV: 5, November, 1928

THE COLLEGE TEACHER

The Addresses and Proceedings
of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting

BY ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

and

President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board
The Hon. Vincent Massey, Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States from the Dominion of Canada
President Emeritus William Louis Poteat, Wake Forest College
President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College
President W. P. Few, Duke University
President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College
President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College
Director Charles H. Judd, School of Education, The University of Chicago
Dean Melvin E. Haggerty, University of Minnesota
President W. W. Boyd, The Western College for Women
Director Charles R. Mann, American Council on Education
Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University
President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College
Professor Bert E. Young, Indiana University
Treasurer Raymond N. Ball, University of Rochester
Warden Bernard I. Bell, St. Stephen's College

Price, 85 cents postpaid to members of the Association of American Colleges; \$2.00 postpaid to all others. Association of American Colleges BULLETIN, Vol. XV: 1, March, 1929

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

USES AND ABUSES OF STANDARDIZATION

BY ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*
Professor FLOYD W. REEVES,
The University of Chicago
President JOHN C. ACHESON,
Macalester College

MORE VITAL AND REASONABLE METHODS OF EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT

President CHARLES E. DIEHL,
Southwestern

OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN TEACHERS IN FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES

Associate Secretary ARCHIE M. PALMER

A STUDY OF TUITION FEES IN 271 ENDOWED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Research Assistant RUTH E. ANDERSON

Price, 25 cents postpaid to members of the Association of American Colleges; 75 cents postpaid to all others. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, Vol. XV: 2, May, 1929.

EDUCATING THE EDUCATORS

PART II—THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF YOUNG COLLEGE TEACHERS

BY ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*
Associate Secretary ARCHIE M. PALMER
and
Association College Executives

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER IN COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE

J. FREDERICK LARSON
*Member of the Permanent Commission on College Architecture
and College Instruction in Fine Arts*

THE SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES OF THE SMALL DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGE

RAYMOND B. STEVENS
Professor of Sociology, Elmira College
Price, 25 cents postpaid to members of the Association of American Colleges; 75 cents postpaid to all others. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, Vol. XV: 4, December, 1929.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE

By

ROBERT LINCOLN KELLY, *Editor*

and

President A. Lawrence Lowell, Harvard University

President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College

Doctor Clarence C. Little, formerly President of University of Michigan

Doctor Max Mason, formerly President of the University of Chicago

President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College

President Silas Evans, Ripon College

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College

President Kerr D. Macmillan, Wells College

President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board

Vice-Rector Edward A. Pace, The Catholic University of America

Dean John R. Effinger, University of Michigan

Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University

Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College

Dean William E. Smyser, Ohio Wesleyan University

Dean Lucius H. Holt, United States Military Academy

Secretary Clyde Furst, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Rector James H. Ryan, The Catholic University of America

Director Adam Leroy Jones, Columbia University

Professor Floyd W. Reeves, The University of Chicago

Director Edward Robinson, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Professor John S. P. Tatlock, Harvard University

Professor Robert C. Brooks, Swarthmore College

Comptroller William O. Miller, University of Pennsylvania

Mr. Thomas Whitney Surette, Lecturer, Harvard University

Mr. Herbert C. Wise, Architect, Philadelphia

Price, \$2.00

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.